LIFE AND SERVICE SERIES

CHRISTIAN IDEALS IN INDUSTRY

F. ERNEST JOHNSON

ARTHUR E. HOLT

LIFE AND SERVICE SERIES

STUDIES IN THE PARABLES OF JESUS
HALFORD E. LUCCOCK

HEART MESSAGES FROM THE PSALMS
RALPH WELLES KEELER

AMOS, PROPHET OF A NEW ORDER
LINDSAY B. LONGACRE

ELEMENTS OF PERSONAL CHRISTIANITY
WILLIAM S. MITCHELL

THE CHRISTIAN IN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS
DORR FRANK DIEFENDORF

DEUTERONOMY, A PROPHETIC LAWBOOK
LINDSAY B. LONGACRE

CHRISTIAN IDEALS IN INDUSTRY
F. ERNEST JOHNSON AND ARTHUR E. HOLT

LIFE AND SERVICE SERIES
Edited by HENRY H. MEYER

Christian Ideals in Industry

BY
F. ERNEST JOHNSON
and
ARTHUR E. HOLT

Approved by the Committee on Curriculum
of the Board of Sunday Schools of the
Methodist Episcopal Church

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

THIS book has been written for the use of young people's and adult classes in our church schools. It is hoped that it may likewise be serviceable to the individual reader. No effort has been made to lay down formal principles or to prescribe rules for modern industry. Rather, the authors have taken it for granted that Christian people are fairly clear in their own minds as to the essential principles of Christianity and have therefore sought only to aid in determining what these principles require in terms of industrial life. The questions that occur so freely in the text, and especially those at the conclusion of each chapter, are quite as important as anything else in the book. We are more interested in stating and analyzing the problems than in any specific solutions that may be suggested in the text.

Doubtless there is no one set of correct answers to the questions we have raised. The working life of the world is so complex that it cannot be dealt with arbitrarily or treated dogmatically. The Christian ideal for industry cannot be once for all prescribed; it must be worked out. It is our hope that what we have written will aid serious-minded Christians who have a spirit of inquiry and who desire to study the moral problems of industry to push a little farther along the Christian way of life.

THE AUTHORS.

CHAPTER I

THE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM AND HOW IT CAME ABOUT

Genesis 1. 26-30; 13. 7-9; Isaiah 1. 18-20

WHY is it that we habitually speak of labor and industry as "problems"? Are they moral problems, which concern the ordinary citizen, or are they mainly technical questions of business and engineering, with which most of us have little to do? Is there any clear distinction between technical questions and moral questions? Have we as Christian citizens any responsibility for the industrial situation? How did the industrial struggle originate, and must it remain with us always?

THE INDUSTRIAL PROBLEM—WHOSE PROBLEM IS IT?

To be sure, it does not seem to be everybody's problem. Plenty of people are not interested in it. Perhaps not everyone who has decided to buy this book is really convinced that the industrial problem is anything he should worry about. Probably most of us, unless we are actually engaged somewhere in the process of manufacturing goods or of selling them, think of industry as something far removed from us.

Nevertheless, all have a very close relation to the working world. Industry is so elemental that it "gets" us all. Take, for example, the great strikes of 1922, on the railroads and in the bituminous coal mines. Every business man, every worker, every citizen, had something at stake in the settlement of those great conflicts. The relationship is just as close, even if not so conscious, in time of industrial peace. If we do not actually gain our living through a pay envelope, we are customers of those who sell the products of industry, and we have a first-hand inter-

est in the quality and price of what we buy. If we, or those who earn the money that we live on, are engaged in professional or commercial pursuits, the prosperity of the community is a matter of first importance to us, and that, in turn, depends chiefly on the community's industries. That is to say, a town or city prospers only as its workers are employed at good wages so that they can buy what they need and thus the merchants may have customers, the banks may have borrowers, the doctors' patients may have money to pay them, the lawyers may have a practice which only active business can give, and so on all along the line. Even the churches reflect very quickly any change in the general prosperity of the community. In fact, all our activities are closely related to industry.

The War That Has No Armistice

It is a commonplace that industry to-day is characterized by strife and discontent. Grievances are encountered everywhere. There are hostile groups of employers and workers which every now and then involve the whole community in controversy, sometimes in serious privation and loss. Many cities and country communities are in an almost continuous state of stress and strain because of industrial unrest and controversy. Some of us have lived in or visited cities where strikes were in progress. It is nothing less than war on a small scale—and sometimes on a fairly big scale. There are communities where a deep resentment and hostility smolder all the time in the hearts of working people and of their employers. The fact is, industrial controversy is so much in the air to-day that one may be drawn into it even against his will whether he is in a Pullman car or a barber shop.

This aspect of struggle which the industrial world presents affects different people in different ways. Some are attracted by it. It offers adventure, a thrilling game with great stakes in money, prestige, and power. Some are embittered by it because of thwarted ambitions and hopes. Some look upon it dull-eyed and listless because they have already been broken and submerged by it. Some are moved to moral indignation because of injustices that re-

sult from it. They find in the industrial situation a denial of the Christian ideal. What shall we find in it?

Playing the Game

Perhaps the most striking thing about modern industry is that in spite of all the fighting and the bitterness, and in spite of the distress at the lower end of the economic scale and the anxiety often suffered at the upper end, the work of the world still goes on with a great deal of enthusiasm. To be sure, most of the enthusiasm is among those who are "getting on." There are multitudes to whom their daily work is a drab routine. But almost everyone who isn't "getting on" seems to hope later to hit his stride. The whole performance is very much of a game. For some the stakes are great; for some they are relatively small. But for most healthy human beings there is in their work, as in their play, an element of gamble—a hazard and a hope. Next to bread, men seem to demand adventure. In greater or less measure their work gives it to them.

Is it not instructive, when one thinks of it, that we use the word "game" so much in describing our serious activities? "What business are you in?" a man is asked. "Oh, I'm in the chain-store game" is a typical form of reply. Young people are counseled as they approach maturity and the responsibilities of adult life to

"Play up, play up, and play the game!"

The essence of the Rooseveltian morals which have become almost a part of American tradition was in "playing the game according to the rule." In his thirty-third year Andrew Carnegie cast up accounts and wrote a memorandum which was discovered after his death. In it he said, "Whatever I engage in I must push inordinately; therefore, I should be careful to choose that life which will be the most elevating in its character." Here we have it again—"push inordinately"; it is the urge of the game.

In this respect all people are very much alike, no matter to what group they belong. They are playing the same game and they seek the same rewards. And because the

stakes of the game are limited—because it *is* a game, and somebody stands to win and somebody stands to lose—the contest is sharp and often bitter. There must be some accounting for the way in which selfishness and bitterness and greed have entered into the world of business and industry. Are we to take literally the Old Testament story of the coming of manual toil as the fruit of "man's first disobedience," or can work be redeemed and industrial relations be made happy and wholesome?

The Road We Have Traveled—the Industrial Revolution

We shall have a close-up of this whole situation later on. For the present let us inquire how the industrial tangle came about, in order that we may play our part in whatever needs to be done. For we cannot escape some responsibility, even if it is limited to voting on industrial questions when they have become political issues. Such issues often play a big part in national and State politics. The pity of our democracy is that while too few people are both intelligent and conscientious about the problems to be solved, the worthless opinion—if there is any quite worthless—registers as well as any other. Can we not at least assume "the moral obligation to be intelligent"?

The industrial situation, to be understood, has to be seen against its historical background. The Industrial Revolution, which took place in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, worked a profound change in the lives of men and women both in England and America. It brought about the regime of power-driven machinery, whereby the work of many skilled hands could be done much more quickly, more accurately, and more cheaply by elaborate mechanisms driven by steam. A few inventions, accompanied by the rapid development of coal mining, made it possible to manufacture enormous quantities of goods and thus potentially to improve the standards of living.

What the Machine Did to the Individual

The new factory system brought about great changes

not only in the organization of industry but in the lives of the working people as well. It centered interest in the establishment—in equipment, in capital. The individual workman became a mere accessory. Hitherto he had been central in industry. His status in the community was more nearly comparable to that of a professional man than to that of a modern factory worker. A trade meant something distinctive and gave both economic security and social status. What is still more important, the craftsman's interest prior to the Industrial Revolution was in no definite way opposed to that of his employer. He passed normally through the three stages—apprentice, journeyman, and master craftsman, or employer. Under such conditions no labor movement worthy the name could arise. But with the beginning of modern industrial organization based upon a capitalist system of ownership, the cleavage between owner and worker appeared and it has steadily deepened. Out of the factory system of manufacture has come a new industrial world.

Crowding the People Off the Land

These industrial changes, which were going on in England from, let us say, 1760 on, were accompanied by far-reaching agricultural changes. New methods of farming were developed with elaborate schemes of draining, fertilizing, and rotation of crops; the raising of new crops was begun, and new breeds of stock appeared. All this caused the millions of tracts of uninclosed common land to be looked upon enviously by capitalists who were coming forward with greatly increased offerings of money to finance large scale production. Thus there was brought about the "inclosure" of common lands in such wholesale fashion that the poor who had supplemented their incomes by means of these lands suffered new hardship. A bit of doggerel of the period tells the story:

> "The law looks up the man or woman
> Who steals the goose from off the common;
> But leaves the greater villain loose
> Who steals the common from the goose."

Laissez Faire—"Less Government in Business"

The small landholders, like the domestic manufacturers, were engulfed by the new regime. An old civilization was passing away. The political status of the worker changed. His living had been in some measure safeguarded by the state. At least it was assumed that such was the duty of the state. Not so any longer. A new doctrine of "individualism" arose, expressed by the French term *laissez faire*—"let alone." According to this theory it was contrary to natural law to attempt to control economic forces. They must be allowed to work themselves out. This process was held to be altogether consistent with religion and humanitarianism. It was by no means consciously immoral. On the contrary, it was carefully worked out that the best way to provide for *all* individuals was to let *each* individual have his own way (within the limits of the penal law) and to seek his own ends. The idea was that more people would be well served if everyone were free to serve himself. Thus "enlightened self-interest" came into prominence in moral philosophy.

Why should this system of industrial organization and of ethics be called "individualism"? The record we are examining indicates that it worked more havoc among individuals than any other philosophy or scheme in history. Yet it is not inaptly named, since it vested control in the individual—any individual who could exercise it. It put the mass of individuals at the mercy of the few. It said to the state: "Let people alone. Let those who can, do." It was not unlike the slogan we hear nowadays, "Less government in business!" Here was the enthronement of

> ". . . the good old rule,
> . . . the simple plan,
> That they should take who have the power
> And they should keep who can."

Religion and Privilege

This could result in only one thing—concentration of power and privilege in a few hands. And along with this

change came an interesting religious development. Men of vast possessions began to conceive of themselves as especially ordained of God to hold the wealth of the world in their hands. The magnitude of these changes is accentuated if we remember that only about two centuries before, England was deciding whether it should be lawful for a man to accept interest on his money. Usury, now limited in its significance to unlawful interest, originally meant interest in any amount. The objection to interest, and hence to the very central principle of capitalism, was made on scriptural grounds, and it was so strong that the first time the English Parliament legalized interest it was obliged to rescind its action. Apparently the moral and religious sentiment on the subject was overwhelmed by the tide of economic development.

"Old Worlds for New"

So gigantic were the changes which preceded and accompanied the Industrial Revolution. An English writer, Arthur J. Penty, brought out a book a few years ago under the caption *Old Worlds for New*—turning about the title made famous by H. G. Wells. In it he advocated a return to the simple organization of industrial society —less machinery, less speed, which would mean less luxury goods. He proposed that we should return to the state of affairs that existed before the factory system broke out in the industrial world. Such a return to the "simple life" would certainly have a startling effect on our industrial order. But is there any likelihood that mankind will ever persuade itself that the way forward is to be found in limiting the inventive, creative, labor-saving, speed-producing activities of modern science? On the contrary, even the most idealistic of reformers seem to look for the attainment of the ideal not in putting limits upon scientific progress but in the social control of what we make. At the same time, from the Christian point of view, one is inclined to ask whether Mr. Penty and those who hold with him have not made out a challenging case. Even though we assume, as probably most of us do, that modern economic and industrial evolution has been inevitable, is

it not sobering and salutary to consider the price that has been paid for industrialism?

The American Tradition

The *laissez-faire* idea was given classic expression in a book, the *Wealth of Nations,* by Adam Smith, which appeared in the very year our Declaration of Independence was signed. Thus, while we were declaring political independence of England we were taking over the new economic individualism that was becoming regnant there. American industry grew up under the traditions that were created at that time. Economic individualism, transplanted to America, throve like a weed in a freshly dug garden. Here was unlimited opportunity. Every enterprising person, whatever kind of natural resources he set himself to exploit and conserve, had at his disposal the lavish provisions of nature. The New World required little for its conquest and cultivation save adventurous, ambitious spirits who sought to carve themselves fortunes out of the wilderness. In this atmosphere of freedom, independence, and adventure the ideals of America were forged. Those ideals are expressed in such terms as independence, private rights, individual initiative, economic freedom—all, of course, within limits laid down by the rules of the game. And the rules of the game are such as to guarantee to every person a maximum of freedom for the exercise of property rights.

This process has borne fruit in religion as well as in business and industry. The tremendous number of religious sects is a reflection of the ideal of free expression for the individual. Differentiation rather than conformity, freedom rather than discipline, rights rather than duties —these have been the emphases.

The Passing of the Frontier

All this worked well in America from the point of view of visible, material results, so long as we had a frontier. The restless spirit who would not conform or submit to discipline had only to push out into the wilderness and become a hero and grow rich. America has been explored,

conquered, and subdued by people who had a certain contempt for the restraint of law and convention. Corporations obtained concessions of fabulous worth; mineral lands were preempted and held against a day of the community's future need; the sites for future cities were bought for a song, and their purchasers made millionaires in return for nothing but waiting. And while this process of concentration was going on, the stratification of economic society was becoming more and more marked. Keeping pace with the exploitation of resources were the spread of power machinery and the growth and concentration of industrial populations. And presently—a decade or so before the end of the nineteenth century—the frontier became exhausted; there were no more fields to conquer. Our great individualistic economic order began to fall back upon itself. Prospectors who had found it easy to avoid conflict with their neighbors over rival claims, and corporate interests that had found it simpler to obtain new concessions than to engage in competitive strife now had to contend with one another—competition began to grow keen. From that time on economic individualism in America meant that most individuals were to be pressed very close to the ground in order that the few might be unrestrained in their pursuit of gain. It would go without saying, perhaps, that the present industrial situation is not the product of anyone's design—it "just growed."

The Plight of the Farmer

As in England, our industrial changes have been accompanied by agricultural changes. With the virtual exhaustion of public lands, farming has become a precarious and burdensome occupation save for those with abundant skill and resources. Land holdings have tended to become concentrated, and tenant farming has become more widespread and less profitable. The small farmer has found himself in competition with the big manufacturer for labor and for capital as well.

Thus the farmer's relation to the industrial situation is paradoxical. He is more and more hostile to big combinations of capital because of the great difficulty he has had

in financing his operations. He deeply resents the way in which transportation privileges have been monopolized. At the same time he has a tendency to be unsympathetic with industrial labor because of its demands for higher cash wages and shorter working hours.

The Class Struggle

Thus there has gradually appeared a phase of what the socialists call the class struggle. There is, to be sure, no unified working-class movement parallel to what is found in several European countries, but those who work for wages have come little by little to consciousness of a common interest and of what they consider a common foe. On the other hand, the propertied class and all whose interests are identified with theirs tend also to become class conscious. The cleavage has deepened since the Great War ended. There was a certain recklessness about the way labor questions were handled during the war. The employer could better afford to settle a dispute on almost any terms than to suffer a stoppage. The end of the war was the signal for a reckoning, and since the Armistice a bitter fight has been waged in American industry.

We are now in an unstable equilibrium of balanced hostile powers; yet the return of business prosperity is giving some respite. We seem to be on an upward curve of the business cycle. Shall prosperity be used for the betterment of industrial relations or will the next depression find us with our lesson unlearned?

For the Discussion Group

Do you agree that one of the strongest incentives in business and industry is the impulse to "play the game"? Do men play a clean game as eagerly as a crooked game?

Are there aspects of the industrial game that are obviously unchristian? What are they? Is the difficulty with the game itself or with the way in which it is played?

Would it be possible to go back to a simpler economic order with less luxury, less machinery, and a smaller

variety of goods? Would it be desirable? Is there any likelihood that we shall ever try it?

Is the element of struggle that we find in the industrial world a wholesome factor in human life? Is it necessary in order to develop character? Is it inevitable?

If individualism has done harm in the industrial world, was it incidental to industrial development, or is the individualistic ideal itself incompatible with Christianity?

Is the average worker better off because of the Industrial Revolution or worse off? Are you thinking in terms of income or of personality?

Some people say that the great game being played in business and industry is crude and materialistic, but that it is in accord with human nature and that there is no alternative. Others say that nothing is wrong except that the rules of the game are not always fair; they would regulate the competitive struggle. Still others maintain that the competitive struggle over the goods of life is in itself wrong and needless; they would change the stakes of the game from material to spiritual rewards. What do *you* say?

CHAPTER II

WHAT INDUSTRY DOES TO THE EMPLOYER

Matthew 20. 1-14; 25-28

One of two men who were recently discussing the industrial situation remarked, "I wish we could have a calm consideration of the question, Who is being hurt in industry to-day?" He meant that the whole situation is so marked by conflict and partisanship and admits of so many contrary yet plausible contentions that the only way to proceed with any assurance is to consider dispassionately everybody's grievance—or, to put it slangily, to listen to everybody's "squeal." Would not this be a good way to approach our task, asking the question successively for the employer, the worker, and the consumer —meaning by that term, of course, the whole community? First, then, how is the employer hurt in industry to-day? Not merely in a physical or financial sense, but morally, spiritually? Is the industrial game unfair to him? Would the average employer change places with one of his employees?

Fellow Sufferers in Industry

An enterprising newspaper writer a few years ago introduced a friend of his who was a member of the I. W. W. to another friend who was a millionaire business man. They met in the latter's library, and he took possession of the interview from the start. The one-sided conversation was something like this: "You fellows think you are badly used. As a matter of fact, you don't know what trouble and hardship are. You have no properties to defend, no investment to worry over, no trusts to be responsible for. You don't know what it is to lie awake at night with a business man's load of care on your mind." Before he could go further, his new acquaintance stretched out his hand and said, "Brother, this damned social order

ain't no good for either of us, is it?" Perhaps no incident could have shown more dramatically the heritage of trouble that is visited upon both sides of the present industrial world.

Another very illuminating incident is one that has been related in the press about the West Virginia coal mine that is owned by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. This is an extraordinary example of a labor group turning employer and experiencing the ills that employing flesh is heir to. A strike was called by the mine workers' union against the union owners of the mine. Such a quarrel always has at least two sides, but on its face it indicates that if two groups of union men, when one of them begins to play the rôle of employer, encounter serious difficulties, a lifelong employer who has less opportunity to know the workers' point of view ought to be listened to with respectful attention, whether in any particular case he is right or wrong.

The Hazards of Business

The employer is at a tremendous advantage over the industrial worker in that he owns the works and his immediate hazards are fewer. A month of sickness will not pauperize him. A quarrel with a foreman will not cost him his job. But he has a multitude of hazards of which the workman knows nothing. One month he may be highly prosperous with all the contracts he can fill, and in another month, owing to a sudden change in the market for either his raw materials or his finished goods, his profits may be wiped out. A financial stringency may cost him his customary credit at the bank; a change in competitive conditions may shift him from the foremost ranks to the rear of the industrial procession; a physical disaster may wipe out his property beyond all possibility of adequate reimbursement by insurance; laws may be passed that make hitherto perfectly legitimate practices illegal; a strike, due to conditions over which he has no control, for demands with which he may even sympathize, may virtually ruin his business. Aside from all these catastrophic happenings, the employer may habitually

suffer from a noncooperative spirit on the part of the workmen which he is at a loss to understand. They may use obstructive tactics—sabotage; they may limit output for reasons which appear to them wholly justifiable; yet the result may be that the employers' prosperity is turned into a serious reverse.

The "Hard-Headed Business Man"

We speak commonly of "hard-headed" business men—sometimes latterly the term used is "hard-boiled." Perhaps it is not too much to say that the type those words describe is the natural product of a business regime that abounds in risks, in unpredictable events, in hard competitive struggles, in personal disillusionments, and in at least as many disastrous failures as successes. When it is remembered that a very large proportion of industrial enterprises fail, it hardly seems inaccurate to say that an industrial employer's career is less the pursuit of success than the attempt to escape failure. Such is the effect of our highly competitive order. If we are seeking a Christian ideal for industry, it must be one that can successfully take account of the situation we have been picturing.

It happens not infrequently that an employer, through getting a "rotten deal," loses his sympathy for labor. One of the present writers has an employer friend of fine character, whose conscience is as sensitive to inequities in industrial relationships as to a failure in personal integrity. He urged his employees to join a union. After they had done so, a new kind of leadership appeared, a disastrous strike followed, he suffered attacks upon his property (which injured his feelings more than his buildings), and now he says, "Never again!" Yet in a tone of troubled seriousness, he added to the narrative of his experience: "If the men are not organized, they will be exploited. What can I do?" But when the fight broke he fought like the others—fire with fire.

Then, too, many employers are unfeignedly fearful of radicalism. How much ground there is for this fear is not in question here; only the fact of the employers' atti-

tude matters. And just as the tendency prevails in government and in education, especially since the Great War, to foster "correct thinking" by repressing what is considered to be wrong, so the employer tends to oppose radicalism by belligerent and repressive measures. He may confuse very harmless undertakings and very proper aspirations with "red" propaganda because he does not understand them. And the vague fear that he harbors makes him nervous, irritable, and hard to get on with. It is quite common for employers to classify all labor representatives and organizers as "agitators" and to treat them as enemies. And so long as industrial relations rest on a competitive struggle over wages and work conditions, only the employer with much sympathy and discernment is likely to feel otherwise.

The Moral Hazards of Employers

The intellectual perplexities and moral hazards of the employer in the present industrial situation are beyond computation. One is sometimes amazed to find how warm a heart beats beneath an exterior of resentment and suspicion. An employer, recently, in conversation with a minister, maintained an attitude of reserve until he found that the other man had some understanding of his difficulties; then he opened up and confessed his own yearning for an ethical and spiritual adjustment of the contradictory elements in his experience.

From an ethical point of view the employer is perhaps harder hit in industry than the worker. That is to say, he has to face most contradictory situations. Take, for example, the employer who professes allegiance to Christian standards of conduct, who believes in the Golden Rule and the ideal of service and "stewardship." How can he live up to all these ideals and still build up his business on a margin so small that his employees have to live on less than even a conservatively estimated living wage?

The Employer's Code of Ethics

A recent analysis of this problem, given by a well-

known employer, is very illuminating in that it shows the ethical predicament in which a man with professed high ideals may find himself. Surely we shall make little headway in quest of the Christian ideal save as we take account of such actual situations and practical necessities as are here disclosed. This employer asked the question, "What is my duty as an employer of labor?" And he answered it in brief thus: "I must employ my men under good, wholesome conditions of work, and I must pay them just wages—but no more." Then he asked the question, "What is my duty to my employees as a man?" And in answer to it he reasoned thus: "If a workman has received just wages, has had everything from me that my duty as an employer dictates, and is still in need and comes to me as a man for assistance, then as a brother I must be generous with him. The two relationships are entirely separate and must not be confused." Now, the interesting thing about this analysis is that it is inevitable unless one questions the moral quality of the existing system of relationships. If "just" wages are determined by a law that has no reference to brotherhood, if corporate relations are one thing and personal relations another, then one need not be concerned about the Christian ideal for industry. On that supposition one learns from economics how to be a good employer, and from ethics and religion how to be a good man. Whatever may be said for this dualism, no justification for it can be found in the New Testament.

Caught in the Machine

The point is that the employer is primarily a business man seeking to make money. He is driven relentlessly by the logic of his position to the acceptance without question of the existing commercial regime in industrial society. Thus he becomes less and less concerned about an inclusive Christian ideal. His conscience is satisfied if he obeys the rules of the game.

Not the least disadvantage, morally, of an employer is the hardening effect of being forced to be always on the defensive. With an active "progressive" movement in

politics, and an aggressive labor movement, the employer is tempted to disregard all moralizing, to take a cynical attitude toward his critics, and to go complacently on his own way. He finds escape from an intolerable situation by assuming a certain hardness and indifference. There could scarcely be a better illustration of this attitude than the report that emanated from the American Iron and Steel Institute in the spring of 1923 on the proposal to eliminate the twelve-hour day. It was an extraordinary document defending the long working day and setting at naught the contrary findings of scientific investigators and the protests of citizens and churchmen. Many of the men who voted to adopt the report are themselves churchmen whose earnestness could not be questioned. But the business of being a manufacturer and an employer in a time of bitter controversy breeds cynicism and renders a man less susceptible to elemental human considerations. All this suggests the well-known tendency of business men to keep matters of personal friendship separate from business matters lest the former be destroyed by the latter. A Congressional committee which was considering, a year or so after the Armistice, the sending to Europe of fifty million bushels of wheat out of the profits of the United States Grain Corporation, for the relief of suffering there, met the appeals of representative churchmen and citizens with a remarkable coolness, declining to be moved by "sentiment." It was a typical "hard-headed" business reaction, and had no visible relation to the private characters of the men. They were not, at least in the capacity in which they were there assembled, employers or business men, but they had been molded to a business psychology.

A Business Man at His Worst

Furthermore, a man who is a very humane employer and who gets on well with his men may be hard and unfeeling when he acts as spokesman for employing interests. The more representative he becomes, the more belligerent he is likely to be. A certain railroad president is thought well of by his men and the unions with which

he deals; but when he speaks for the railroad executives of the country he acquires the attitude of a generalissimo, whose business it is to put up a stiff fight and give no quarter.

The activities of many employers' associations are belligerent in the extreme, and their publicity efforts irritating, mischievous, and positively misleading, although the individual members are men of fine character and not at all harsh or crude in their personal attitudes. These very men will criticize labor leaders, and often justly, on the ground that they misrepresent their membership, while they themselves employ publicity men and association organizers whose main qualification is their capacity to fight with cruel and dishonorable weapons. It may well be argued that the "open-shop" war of the past three years would never have aroused such bitterness if employers had fought their battle themselves instead of allowing hirelings to do it for them—men who had no first-hand interest in industry nor any adequate knowledge of labor and who considered that they must smash labor organizations in order to earn their salaries.

The Conscience of a Corporation

It would be quite unfair to employers as individuals not to take account of the peculiar responsibilities of corporations. Directorship in an industrial corporation carries with it a responsibility not only for employees but for investors. Because wages are assumed to be regulated by the "labor market," the director keeps his mind on earnings and risks and other questions pertaining to finance. The investors are often for the most part people of moderate income. They are as likely to complain as the workers are if they do not get a "living dividend." Like banks, industrial corporations usually try to play safe; they will risk anything rather than the loss of their capital. Then, too, they act at several removals from the people whom their acts affect. The classic expression of Professor Ross, "sinning by syndicate," is always in point. The human consequences of the decisions reached in directors' meetings are often but dimly seen.

A Good Employer and a Bad Manager

Moreover, few people realize what the employer of an idealistic turn of mind is up against when he tries to change things in his own plants. Industrial managers are hard to get. Those who are successful were trained in the days when "hiring and firing" was a simple and crude process. They change the ideas and habits of a lifetime with great difficulty. There is a common fiction that a wealthy man who owns fifty-one per cent of the stock of a corporation can have his own way in a matter of policy by the mere act of voting. As a matter of fact, many an owner finds himself in a position of humiliating helplessness because of his inability to impart his own views and desires to his organization. An expert plant manager or mine superintendent will sometimes bring his fist down on the table before his theoretical superior who wants to change the labor policy and say: "I have other matters to think of besides labor conditions. I am delivering to you on twenty things. Don't rock the boat by interfering in one of them." It is not a question of discharging a hard-boiled manager; he must be converted and trained over again.

A socially minded employer will, of course, not claim an alibi because he cannot control things all the way down the line. The situation is a result of a long history of irresponsibility. The recent troubles in bituminous coal fields have shown that the most inexcusable practices can go on without the knowledge of officers of the company in question. A veritable conspiracy may exist on the part of superintendents and foremen against what they consider the impracticable ideas of men "back in New York," who do not know conditions on the field. The case is very similar to that of Lincoln's interference for humanitarian reasons with discipline at the battle front. There is a tradition in industry that the officers of a company should never interfere in matters of labor policy any more than in the matter of placing machinery or routing materials through the plant.

Great advance is being made by some concerns through

an entirely new discipline of personnel management. Little by little, employers and great corporations are becoming conscientious on this subject, are making researches on their own account, and are seriously asking not merely what is expedient but what is right in industrial relations.

For the Discussion Group

If you were a workman would you be willing to accept the employer's burdens if you could have his advantages?

Under present conditions can an employer live up to Christian standards and still maintain himself in a competitive market?

What do you say of the employer's analysis, given in the text, of his duty as an employer and his duty as a man? Does Christianity require anything more than justice? Does it require that a man be generous at the risk of going bankrupt?

Does the term "hard-headed business man" describe a real type? If so, is it a matter of individual temperament or is that type the natural product of a commercial and competitive regime? Do business men in general like the term?

Is "sinning by syndicate" any more excusable than sinning alone? Is it any more understandable?

What responsibility, if any, has a corporation director for unethical acts of the corporation, of which he does not approve? What course is open to him? Would resigning simplify the matter?

If an owner in New York or Chicago finds that he cannot have his way in labor policy in his plants at Louisville or Omaha, is he thereby relieved of responsibility? What can he do?

CHAPTER III

HOW INDUSTRY AFFECTS THE WORKER

Exodus 1. 8-14; Isaiah 10. 1, 2

How is the worker being "hurt" in industry to-day? Has he a just ground for complaint, or are his grievances exaggerated? Does he get enough wages? Some people think labor is too highly paid. What is the personal status of the workers as to security, initiative, self-expression? What of the labor unions—are they good for the workers? Are they good for the rest of us? Should they be curbed or encouraged?

The Workers' Heritage From the Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution, which we sketched in the preceding discussion, has had a pronounced effect on the lot of the individual worker. He plays a very different part in modern industrial life from that played by his gildsman ancestor. What relation has this change to the Christian ideal? It goes without saying that a primary purpose of industry is to produce goods. But would not Jesus' way of looking at the matter be something like this?—We must have goods—bread, cloth, wood, metal, leather, and so on, but to what end? Does commerce exist for man, or man for commerce? If the making of goods for man as consumer works a great injury to man as producer, is not the end of industry frustrated? We must learn how to make the goods of life in a way that will enrich the lives of those who work. If that is a Christian ideal, it is to be feared we are pretty far from its realization.

What effect does the thing called division of labor have upon the thing called personality? Every person wants to count in some definite way and to fulfill some definite

purpose. Is it not much easier to play a definite part in the world of work if a person makes and sells a commodity for which he acquires a reputation than if his work is confined to a few blows of a hammer or a few turns of a lathe, whose effect only a skilled artisan can appreciate and which the user of the finished product is hardly aware of?

Consider the very honorable though insufficiently recognized trade of cooking, and suppose that it should be completely factoryized so that a score of people instead of one participated in the making of a pie. Without regard to the effect on the product, which might, of course, be thoroughly beneficial, would not the psychology of the whole business be seriously changed? When a person cannot be more or less identified with his work in the finished product, whether it is making violins or digging post holes, he profits in his personality but little from the operation.

What It Means to Own Nothing

The loss of ownership of one's tools has the same general effect. Just as a musician acquires proficiency with a specific instrument and a fondness for it, just as a ball-player becomes devoted to a certain bat or glove, or a golf player to his pet driver, so a mechanic becomes attached to a particular set of tools. If he owns them, he is by that fact so much more an artisan. Mr. Whiting Williams gives a pathetic picture of a worker's relation to a tool which he has come to regard as an indispensable possession.[1] He tells of a "hunkie" laborer who fought like a tiger for the possession of a shovel. "My shovel! I use it t'ree mont's. My shovel—he take it." The ownership of one's tools, like the ownership of one's house, is an expression of personality. In this case, of course, the ownership was fancied.

It may be said that the worker in this respect is no worse off than the average "white-collar" worker who does not even own the pen and ink with which he writes,

[1] *What's on the Worker's Mind*, p. 36.

to say nothing of the stenographer whose pencils belong to the "house." It is perhaps a sufficient answer that the status of such workers is, indeed, often quite comparable to that of the factory worker, but that in the life of the office worker there are frequently intellectual and social compensations.

The Dread of Losing a Job

The loss of ownership of one's tools which has come about with the modern factory system robs the worker of independence and security. This change has gone hand in hand with the loss of ownership of his home. He has now become a tenant in his home and a tenant in the shop. He is there by favor, not by right, and even if the sharpness of this dependence is taken away by the most considerate treatment, his status is none the less fortuitous. This fact contributes much to the discontent in industry to-day. Mr. Williams has given a classic account of the effect of unemployment, not merely in actuality, but in menace. "Last night for an hour I stood at the gate with twenty-five others, Negroes and foreigners, peering steadily into that plant while the two policemen looked at us from above their blue-coated stomachs as though we were so many hogs threatening to rush in and eat up the place. Men don't seem to chat or make friends then, because each feels the other his competitor; so we all stood shivering, silent, and intent. Whenever we saw anyone we thought might be the boss, we all hunched up our shoulders so as to look husky and tried to catch his eye."[1]

This great defect in our industrial system can perhaps be best seen against the background of efforts to do away with it. The Columbia Conserve Company in Indianapolis has undertaken to put its workers on a salary basis, so that they draw their pay even though temporarily unemployed. Unemployment insurance is being carried out in some plants. The Dutchess Bleachery at Wappingers Falls, New York, sets aside a sinking fund to pay a part of the workers' wages during enforced unemployment.

[1] *What's on the Worker's Mind*, p. 6.

The president of the National Association of Manufacturers, who is in the blanket business, relates how he ran his plant for five months without a profit merely because he considered it right to keep his organization intact and to avoid unemployment. But here, again, merely to cite examples of this sort is to emphasize the fact that they are not typical.

The "Company Town"

An extreme illustration of the plight of the modern industrial worker is found in the "company towns," especially in mining districts, where the worker has a home only so long as he works for the company, and where everything that he touches belongs to the company. He is even deprived of the experience of participating in religious or civic activities in his own right and under conditions within his own power to determine.

Much has been written in the last three years or so about conditions of this sort in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Perhaps the mistake has been made of simply reciting grievances and delinquencies without explaining their origin or indicating any of the difficulties in the way of overcoming them. In most cases the explanation is probably to be found in that tradition of individualism in American industrial life which we briefly traced. New territory has been opened up by industrial enterprises, particularly in mining and lumbering districts, much faster than civic and political organizations have developed, and the company which has opened a mine in a mountain district has had to bear responsibility for sanitation, policing, recreation, education, and even for religious service. The result is a paternalism that is shocking to those who believe in democracy. The employers are not bad men; indeed, they are likely to be more actively interested in social betterment than employers elsewhere. We call them "paternalistic." Yet in many cases if they did not "paternalize," the most elemental social necessities would be entirely neglected. The trouble is that they have made provision for men's bodies more than for their personalities. They have been face to face

with a situation that they did not understand. In such regions labor has fallen into a state of virtual vassalage.

When Men Become Savages

The reaction of labor to such conditions has been sharp, resentful, sometimes violent. Anyone who wishes to know the American industrial situation at its worst—that is, at its farthest from a basis of good will and cooperation—need only study what happened at Blair Mountain in West Virginia in 1921 and in Herrin, Illinois, in 1922. The "armed march" of mine workers through West Virginia and the brutal killing of "scab" miners in Illinois, with the approval of a whole community, by men ordinarily mild-mannered and law-abiding, gives food for serious thought. The superficial view of these happenings is that men suddenly became criminals and committed outrages, and that a recurrence can be prevented only by severe punishment. But drastic action seems to be as little a deterrent of violence in industrial disputes as it is in any other sphere of activity; the remedy must be found in a larger measure of liberty under law and a greater degree of cooperative action based on conference and understanding between the parties in controversy. The fighting animal in our inheritance is never far from the surface. We can insure ourselves against a periodic resort to savagery only by organizing our life on the basis of good will. Which, after all, is more important—that we should have all the coal we want, when we want it, or that while we are mining coal, we should also build men and promote fellowship?

All this is recounted not merely by way of indictment, but by way of description, in order that we may see what the attainment of the Christian ideal involves and what are the obstacles that must be overcome. Strangely enough, outbreaks of violence are usually seized upon merely as evidences of inordinate brutality on one side or the other rather than as evidence that our present war-like regime in industry sometimes puts a strain upon human nature that neither employers nor workers are able to bear.

When Machines Run Men

The division of processes of machine labor makes notoriously ill-proportioned demands upon the powers of the worker, overfatiguing some and letting others lie idle. In most machine work there is nothing to create interest and joy, to arouse curiosity, or to create the desire to overcome a difficulty. This want of stimulation of the natural and instinctive tendencies of mental life not only produces a painful result, but is responsible for nervous derangements without number. Excesses that are severely condemned on moral grounds may be traced to the lack of free play for normal tendencies. The stream dams up and overflows. These baneful effects are accentuated by the similar consequences of housing congestion and the spiritual inbreeding of tenement life.

A few years ago when the labor difficulties following the war reached alarming proportions, a writer in a certain conservative journal, commenting on the cause of unrest, said: "But the new era has put personality in a steel niche, and it must stay put, else large-scale production is impossible. The strikers on our streets to-day are men entering a blind protest against a system that has taken the fun and romance out of their work. . . . Some plan must be found whereby men may become interested in their day's work—this is fundamental. It is a twentieth-century problem, and history gives us no clue to the solution." Such considerations do not invalidate the division of labor, but they do suggest that the culture of personality, if it is to take place at all in industry, must be transferred from industrial processes to other processes. What these processes may be, we must consider.

The Hazards of an Industrial Age

The accidents that occur in modern manufacturing and mining are a matter of common remark. Several mine disasters in the last two or three years have given tragic emphasis to the fact that an industrial worker contracts not only his labor but in a very true sense his personal security and the happiness of his family as well. To be

sure, the complexity of modern life, the high speed of traffic, and the appropriation of the sky and the subterranean regions, to supplement the space offered by the meager surface of the earth—all these peculiar marks of our civilization take their inevitable toll of life and limb quite apart from industry; but the fact remains that many of what we consider essential occupations could never be carried on but for the quiet acceptance by thousands of workers of conditions which to the craftsmen of the Middle Ages would have seemed hazardous in the extreme.

The Doers of the Dirty Work

The specialization of industrial labor also condemns many persons to permanent performance of tasks that are considered menial and that are distasteful to any person who has been touched by culture. The dirty work of the world is done by those who come to be regarded as the dirty people of the world. The fact that many of them accept their lot without serious protest only emphasizes the degradation that they suffer in the minds of their fellows. One cannot examine carefully an industrial community without being impressed with the tendency toward caste which increases with the growth of our industrial system and the increase of our industrial population. Perhaps the most serious aspect of industry from the Christian point of view is the gulf that is built up between groups of human beings, all of whom are doing tasks that are essential to society as a whole, yet many of whom do their work without honor.

This problem strikes most of us right where we live. How is it that we can very largely overcome the tendency to caste in our college communities, where a young man may tend furnaces or a girl may wash dishes to pay board and not forfeit personal standing by it, while in organized adult community life a "menial" task sets definite limits to social relationships? This observation has reference more especially to city life, where specialization is greater, but, after all, every community has its aristocracy and its plebeians. What is wrong?

A Great Gulf Fixed

The depersonalizing of the employer-employee relationship is another effect of the present industrial regime. Employers come to think of workers as a mass of "hands," whose wills and desires express themselves seldom save through agitators, and who constitute an inert mass that resists all efforts at improved efficiency and better production. Few employers who maintain large plants really know the men who work in them. Rather, they know their "labor" in the mass and they impute in a vague way to the whole labor force the ideas and purposes that are conveyed to them by belligerent spirits. Thus "labor" as the employer thinks of it is often an abstraction, not a reality. The complementary fact is quite as striking and as serious. Large employers' names become to working men synonymous with the aggressiveness of the capitalist system at its worst. This condition is accentuated when organization among the workers is lacking. The opportunity for conference and for the presentation of grievances is a tremendous offset to the inferiority of status that labor suffers. It makes all the difference in the world whether employers and labor leaders get their information about each other through direct contact or through underground channels.

The spy system in industry as carried on by multitudes of employers is another factor in widening the breach. It would be impossible to overestimate the harm done and the bitterness engendered by it. It is a kind of fire that is invariably fought with fire. It leads to grave misapprehensions on both sides. Three years ago the church forces in Denver, Colorado, assisted by national church bodies, investigated a serious industrial conflict between the street-car company and its employees, a conflict that had cost the lives of several innocent people. This is what their report said about the spy system that still prevails very widely in industrial America: "It is contended that this is an unavoidable practice. But a sensitive conscience can only look with stern disapproval upon a practice which substitutes suspicion for confidence and

treachery for honest dealing. The spy system defeats itself. It deceives no one, and it invites counterespionage. Its agents tend to provoke the evils which they are supposed to check. It is admittedly a war measure. Must we admit that industry is normally war? The whole system is undoubtedly one of the most disruptive influences in our industrial order."

Trade Unions—Good or Bad?

From one point of view it might almost be said that the consequences of the present industrial regime are equally serious for labor whether it is organized or not. Physically, materially, there is no question as to the gains of the workers through trade unionism. The injustice of preventing such organization is now very widely asserted. Yet even the best-disciplined and best-led unions are belligerent in their tactics, and the prejudice against labor leaders and "agitators" is not hard to understand. The best labor leader, from the point of view of his own constituency, is the best bargainer and the best fighter. As a result of many conflicts, labor has come to think in terms of hostility and combat. Strike threats are too easily resorted to and often too irresponsibly carried out. If this is a misfortune to the community and to the employers, it is more serious in its spiritual consequences to the laborers themselves.

What is the remedy? Seebohm Rowntree, the British Quaker cocoa manufacturer, says that labor leaders in England were of the same belligerent, noncooperative type that is complained of here until the employers stopped fighting the unions. Then the unions stopped electing fighters as leaders and chose men of more statesmanly mold.

The Question of Bread

Underlying all other problems in industry is the fact of insufficient income, with its train of evil consequences in bad housing, poor health, meager education, and bitter feeling. It is overlooked by most of us because we see the bricklayer's twelve dollars a day so large that it ob-

scures the low pay of the unskilled. No matter whose estimate of a living wage is taken, there are multitudes of workers living below the most conservative standard. But "the living wage" is a vague term, and employers are ceasing to take it seriously. The Railroad Labor Board calls it a "bit of mellifluous phraseology." But we shall recur to this subject later.

For the Discussion Group

Must the limitations of the factory system be accepted by labor as unavoidable? Is the worker better off under the highly specialized factory regime, where he makes but a few motions and learns no trade so long as he can make more money? Is the development of personality to be wholly left to leisure time occupations?

A workman, asked about the nature of his job, is said to have replied, "My job is to put on nut number eighty-four." What would be the net spiritual result of that occupation?

Is the industrial worker underpaid or overpaid? Which occupations are you thinking of?

Is the workingman entitled to the same security that the professional worker has? Would it cripple his efficiency to take away his fear of losing his job?

Is "paternalism" good or bad? Is it better for workers to have things done for them or to do things for themselves, even if they cannot do them so well?

Do outbreaks of violence, in mining communities, for example, indicate a low order of intelligence and morality, or do we all act about the same way in time of crisis or trial?

Does the habitual performance of so-called menial tasks affect a person's character? In what direction? Should any person be perpetually required to do such work? What alternative is there?

Granting that labor unions create many problems for the employer and for the community, is the effort to suppress them warranted? Is their total influence good or bad? Is Mr. Rowntree's suggestion applicable to America?

CHAPTER IV

INDUSTRY AND THE COMMUNITY

Nehemiah 4. 21 to 5. 7

"The interest of the public is paramount." Granted the truth of this principle, how much does it mean? How far should the community attempt to control industry and industrial relations? Does the public in general get what is coming to it from industry? How intelligent is the public about industrial issues which it has to take a hand in deciding? How far is the deplorable condition of municipal politics and government in America the result of industrial conditions which the community neglects?

The Public's Share in Industrial Control

A textile mill in New York State in which a scheme of joint management has been worked out has not only employees' representatives on the board of directors but a representative of the community as well, for the purpose of safeguarding the public interest. The proposal is a novel one, but it seems so obviously reasonable and proper that it is strange it has not more often been adopted. The primary interest of the whole community in industry may be taken for granted. Is the community well served by industry at the present time? A fair-minded or optimistically inclined person is obliged to admit that with all its faults the industrial system gives the public more goods, more promptly delivered, and at lower cost than would have been conceivable before the era of machine production. No judgments that we may pass upon the "game" as it is now being played can blind us to the positive achievements of the modern industrial regime. But as in every other phase of human endeavor the ultimate judgment is based not merely upon what is, but upon what might be. It is no permanent justification of a monopoly that it has in the past lowered the cost of a commodity. The question is, Could it serve the community better

now than it does? So with the whole industrial system. Moreover, an industrial organization that can show such an astonishing record of material achievement must be held accountable for its spiritual consequences.

Industry and the "General Public"

The community, using the term in the sense of society generally, has more than one relation to industry. It is consumer, investor, lawmaker, and, so to say, moral arbiter. In one sense, of course, a community in an industrial city is virtually identical with labor. It is often assumed on that account that an industrial community's interests, as such, are identical with those of the working class. If one looks closely at the matter, however, it is seen that the community never reacts that way. The working people as a whole never feel that they have a first-hand interest in a particular industrial question or controversy. Suppose, for example, that the clothing workers are having a conflict with their employers. It does not follow that the boot and shoe workers will sympathize with them; much less, actively support them. The clothing workers' difficulty is of interest to the boot and shoe workers chiefly as it affects the price they pay for clothes. In other words, they are related to the question as consumers on precisely the same basis as the professional classes in the community.

This fact is well known by labor leaders themselves. It is the thing that stands in the way of working-class solidarity. It is illustrated in the failure of the union-label movement to win support from the workers as a whole. A strenuous effort has been made to induce members of labor unions to observe the labels of other unions and buy, so far as possible, only union made goods. But it is very hard to get them to interest themselves as buyers in the label of another union than their own. Although many influences are at work tending to overcome this lack of solidarity among working people, the tendency of various groups to stand apart by themselves seems to be very firmly established in America. In other words, the greater solidarity of the workers as consumers and citizens than

as labor unionists is a prominent characteristic of American industrial life. It is as consumer that the community sustains the most conscious and the most elemental relation to industry. And it is to be feared that the attitude growing out of this relationship is often far from constructive and far from what we could call a Christian ideal.

Is There Enough to Go Around?

The first observation to be made concerning the way in which the community suffers on account of industrial situations is one that could not have been made until recently, namely, that industry is positively failing to produce the goods needed for the life of the community as a whole. For a long time it was assumed that there is enough wealth produced every year, if it were only properly distributed, to provide for the needs of all our people. Now, however, through the labors of the National Bureau of Economic Research, we may state with a good deal of confidence that there is no surplus, but that we run habitually with an economic deficit. This organization, which is a nonpartisan research body, about two years ago made a study of the national income which indicated that in the year 1919 it was approximately $66,000,000,000. The report showed the distribution of income for the year 1918. It is estimated that in that year there were something over 29,000,000 persons who had incomes under $1,700 a year. Now, this is almost the exact figure arrived at by the National Industrial Conference Board—an employer's research organization—as a living standard for a workingman's family in the city of Detroit in September, 1921. On the face of the National Bureau's income report, it would require $20,000,000 a year to bring all incomes under $1,700 up to that minimum. Even if all the incomes in the country over $2,500 were confiscated for this purpose, they would not be sufficient.

The national income must not only maintain our people but must pay the expenses of government, support a multitude of philanthropies, and provide all the capital for the expansion of our industrial equipment and the

development of natural resources. It would appear that in 1919 there was not sufficient to provide our 21,000,000 or more families with an annual income of $2,000 a year each and meet all the necessary additional demands of the nation. The United States Chamber of Commerce estimates that the national income for 1922 was only $50,000,000,000. These surprising figures do not mean that the distribution of wealth is not an important problem, but the question of distribution derives its importance more from moral considerations than from the direct material effect that a redistribution of income would have upon the economic status of masses of the people. On this showing it seems clear that the basic problem of industry from the community's point of view is to produce more goods.

At the same time it must not be overlooked that the distribution of income is an important factor in supplying incentives to greater production. Income statistics indicate that wages do not keep pace with increasing productivity. This fact in itself is sufficient to account for lagging production.

Distributing the Blame

Who is to blame for this failure of our industrial establishment? The employers blame the workers. They point to limitation of output and to demands for high wages which make production unprofitable to the employer. Everyone has heard the story of the successive reductions of a bricklayer's daily work in spite of the relatively high wages that he receives. The workers, on the other hand, have an elaborate defense. Their work time is often interrupted. There are many days when they cannot work. They lose time in shifting from job to job. Their annual income is by no means equal to the amount arrived at by multiplying their daily wages by the number of working days in the year. The problem of underemployment was brought to the public's attention very forcibly during the great coal strike of 1922, when men whose wages were $7.50 a day had so little employment that they were in actual distress.

The employer likewise comes in for criticism. The Federated Engineering Societies' report on "Waste in Industry" puts forward the view that the larger measure of responsibility for eliminating the very extensive waste in industrial processes must be borne by management. And now comes William R. Bassett, the engineer, saying that if manufacturers would equip and organize their plants on a thoroughly efficient basis, even the unskilled workman might have an income equivalent to $10,000 a year!

A Task for the Whole Community

The conclusion seems clear enough that neither the employer nor the worker is exerting himself to the limit to produce goods. Limitation of output is practiced on both sides. The workers have had in the past a disillusioning experience with piece-work rates, which have tended to come down as their production went up. During the war they obeyed the injunction to increase production, and then they found their jobs gone or rendered uncertain because the market was glutted with goods which they had produced but which the employer could not sell. The employer, on the other hand, is playing the only game that he knows. He makes goods with his eye on the market. If he cannot make a profit, he ceases to produce. We are all in the grip of a force which is commonly referred to as the business cycle, which experts of all kinds are struggling to master, and in accord with which we alternate between prosperity and depression. At this moment no one has the answer. But this much seems clear: the problem of production will never be solved so long as employers and workers confine their attention to their own immediate group interest in the production process. To be sure, the problem must be worked out by people of experience and scientific training, but the moral requirements of the situation must be determined by us all.

But even where production is quite adequate we often fail to connect demand with supply, so that goods which many people would gladly consume are left to perish at

the place where they are produced. So much of the price of goods represents nonproductive processes, so many middlemen have to be paid, with the consumer footing all the bills, that it is little wonder the public manifests extreme irritation with both parties in industry.

The Credit Problem

Perhaps equally disturbing from the community's point of view is the working of the modern system of finance and credit. Credit has become more and more vital to industrial enterprise, yet it continues to be a rival enterprise in the sense that the financing of socially useful and necessary undertakings is controlled by a system which is itself a profit-making business. The financial organization of the country has become highly centralized and has in the main identified itself with the most conservative industrial interests. To the labor mind "Wall Street" is synonymous with all that is oppressive. This attitude is a fact of first importance, no matter what one may think of its justification or falsity. The question is being asked to-day if it is not possible to organize finance on a basis of public service rather than a basis of profit. But this is really a subject for a separate study.

The Public's Ignorance

One of the worst features of the community's relation to this whole matter is the inconclusive character of public criticism. Now the employer, now the worker, falls under the ban of public disapproval. But the public mind seldom gets far enough into the problem to suggest a way out. In the case of strikes and lockouts, for example, public sympathy for one side or the other is often manifest, but the placing of that sympathy seems to have little relation to the moral issues of the contest. In the great coal strike of 1922, there was widespread sympathy (if one may judge from the public press) with the workers, while in the railway shopmen's strike which followed, the sympathy was almost entirely on the other side. There was, to be sure, on the face of the facts a difference in the moral status of the two groups, yet hardly enough to ac-

count for the great difference in the public attitude. The explanation seems more probable that while there was a big coal surplus which lessened the public's grievance in the coal strike, the public had an immediate stake of most vital importance in the railroad strike.

It is surely among the worst of the injuries suffered by the community due to the industrial situation that it is woefully uninformed concerning the facts. This applies as much to the country as a whole as to single localities. Is it not strange that we should have had to wait until two years ago for dependable figures concerning our national income? How is it that a question of such fundamental importance as the valuation of our railways should require years of expert study at public expense? Partisan publicity plays a large part in determining economic and industrial issues. Even the effects of a government report, prepared with manifest care and impartiality, may be shattered in the public mind by the guns of well-paid and expertly handled publicity.

Where the Press Fails

The press helps the situation all too little. Newspapers make a show of running their news columns independently of their editorial opinions, but during local industrial controversies most of the news matter seems to go through the editorial mill before it finds its way to the printed page. And it is well known that the accounts of industrial happenings and the interpretation given them are commonly colored from the employers' point of view. This is usually not because newspapers are in a conspiracy with the employers to defeat labor, although this is certainly sometimes true. It seems more to the point to recognize that newspapers themselves are business enterprises controlled by business men, who have a business point of view, are members of a business community, and are governed by business traditions. The newspaper owner is sympathetic with the employer in a labor strike usually for the same reason that any other business man in the community takes the same attitude. But how grave the situation is when the public, whose opinion should de-

termine and, in the long run, frequently does determine industrial controversies, is compelled to make up its mind as to the issues presented on the basis of partisan statements! The fact that some of our greatest newspapers have gone far toward remedying this defect does not lessen the validity of the general criticism.

The growth of the labor press is a protest against the situation we have been considering; but, so far as the public in general is concerned, the labor press has only complicated the situation. For if the public press, commonly referred to in the labor papers as the "capitalist press," is partisan on one side, the labor press is certainly partisan to the same or to a greater extent on the other. The labor press, generally speaking, has a constituency of its own, which pays for a certain interpretation of industrial events and gets what it pays for. It should not be overlooked, however, that there are notable exceptions. As for the trade papers, which represent manufacturing interests, it is difficult to see how they could be more partisan than they are.

Industrial Conditions and Political Democracy

Quite apart from all consideration of industrial struggle or of the price which the consumer pays for the goods he buys, the community has a large stake in industry from a social point of view. Who are the workers in our American factories, mines, and quarries? The ranks of the unskilled are filled largely with foreign-speaking immigrant labor—the "hunkies" of the steel mills and the "wops" of the textile mills. They come to us in hordes and we settle them in hordes. We allow them to colonize in congested quarters of our cities in an environment as different as possible from that to which they were accustomed in their original peasant home in Europe. Thus we have our little Italys and little Bohemias and little Russias, and they remain alien to our life and often alien to our thought. When a community undertakes in commendable fashion to "Americanize" its foreign populations—that is to say, when it undertakes to socialize itself and to end the isolation of these little communities of workers—it encounters

almost insuperable difficulties. The difference in ideals is grounded in different standards which are definitely registered in the pay envelope. The economic levels in the American working community are basic to our industrial organization. How can we isolate groups of our workers economically and then break down that isolation socially? How can we segregate groups of workers economically and assimilate them morally and religiously?

The community's problems of government, education, sanitation, and recreation are immeasurably increased and complicated by the presence of these isolated communities of workers whose existence is fundamental to our present industrial organization. Our municipal politics in America, notorious the world over, continually remind us of the fact that the masses of our city populations serve as material for political exploitation. Civic consciousness and civic virtue cannot rise far beyond the cultural level of these masses.

Leaning Upon the Immigrant

The problem of American immigration, in the last analysis, is a problem of industry. Industry determines, probably more than any other influence, how many foreigners shall come to our shores. When the controversy over the twelve-hour day in the steel industry became acute in the summer of 1923, we were told that the long shift must continue unless more immigrant labor should be imported into the country, and it might have been added, labor that will work under arduous conditions that native-born Americans are inclined to refuse. Industry determines finally the level of life of all these foreign populations. In large measure industry determines also the public policies and the civic activities upon which the improvement of these populations depends.

Industry and the State

The state, which is the whole community in its political capacity, to-day carries the industrial problem as a heavy burden and a perplexing responsibility. How far should it intervene in settling industrial disputes and in determin-

ing wages, prices, and profits? Is the highest ideal to be attained through legislative action and court control, or through voluntary cooperation within industry? A contest is waged each year in a number of States over minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws for women workers. These laws have been championed by labor, by social workers, and by eminent employing concerns, but they have made little headway. Proposals for unemployment or health insurance under State auspices are even less well received by the business community. Yet these measures have very much to recommend them, and from the Christian point of view the burden of proof should rest on the opposition. It seems not unlikely that these measures will come into existence through State action, as workingmen's compensation for accidents has come, unless industry shortly meets the situation on its own initiative. But all such measures win their way slowly. American opinion in general is against governmental interference in the affairs of corporations.

But there is a tendency to deal differently with the problem of industrial conflict. It rests on this simple reasoning: "Industry is a part of the community. The welfare of the general public is paramount, and must take precedence over the desires and purposes of a minority. Therefore, the state must assert itself when the parties to industry cannot agree and must maintain production or service uninterrupted." But it is becoming increasingly evident that when the whole public asserts itself in an emergency it does so on the basis of expediency and its own convenience more often than on the basis of justice. Furthermore, it is coming to be felt that decisions that are enforced and plans that are imposed upon groups of human beings are less effective and less salutary than those reached by cooperative effort and in good will. What hope there is of attaining a Christian ideal by such means we must inquire further.

For the Discussion Group

With reference to any particular industrial dispute how would the members of this group line up—with the

employers, with the workers, or with the general public? What is the ground of our sympathies in such cases?

Is the common statement, "The interest of the public is paramount," fair to industry itself? Does the public always recognize its own ultimate interest? Is the public attitude usually just? On what basis did we make up our minds about the issues of the last coal strike?

A certain clothing manufacturer puts the moral responsibilities of industrial management in this order: first, to the consumer; secondly, to the worker; thirdly, to the investor. Is that the right order?

Whose is the primary responsibility for increased production? Would a fairer distribution of wealth indirectly increase production by giving labor a new incentive?

Would it increase production to insure labor against the privations of unemployment? Should the community bear part of the employer's risk of loss? How could this be done?

If the newspapers were always scrupulously accurate and fair in reporting industrial disputes, would the average person take the trouble to inform himself? Could a newspaper devoted primarily to supplying correct information about such issues pay expenses?

What can be done for foreign workers who live in congested quarters? Does the location of industries in cities compel the workers to live in congested neighborhoods, or are the industries compelled to locate where the workers insist on living?

Who gets closest to the industrial worker—the minister or the crooked politician? Why?

Do we discriminate, in buying goods, between those made under good working conditions and those not so produced? Are we willing to pay the price of good wages and sanitary working conditions?

CHAPTER V

COMPETITION FOR WAGES AND PROFITS—THE OLD GAME

Luke 12. 13-23

Is competition between labor and capital inevitable or is there a possibility of actual partnership? Are business and industry governed by mechanical principles—the law of supply and demand, for example—and if so, how much place is allowed to ethics in the business world? Do natural forces determine with efficiency and fairness what station a man should occupy and what portion of goods he should have? Has Christianity played any important part in building up our industrial regime or has it been steadily pushed aside by the encroachments of material forces?

The "Partnership" of Capital and Labor

One of the writers of this series of lessons published an article on the aims of the labor movement in which he described it against a background of industrial struggle. The secretary of an employers' association remonstrated with him for emphasizing the element of conflict. "This is the idea," he said, "that we are especially anxious to avoid. We want the workers to understand that their interests and those of their employers are identical." This is a note which is very commonly struck in industrial literature of the present day. "Partnership"—that is the word which is most commonly taken to indicate the ideal industrial relationship. To what extent is this a correct account of the relation between employer and employee?

The brief survey that we have been making certainly does not indicate on the face of it that the interests of employers and workers are identical or even harmonious. More than that, the interests of employers and workers, as

such, often seem to be quite out of harmony with those of the community. With strikes going on continually, with the air filled with propaganda and counterpropaganda seeking to convince the public that each of the great parties to industry is right in its contentions and ought to have public support as against the other, is it not idle to say that the interests of employers and workers are identical? Indeed, might one not say that their interests are identical only in the ironical sense that they are both striving to get the same thing?

This view of the matter is, of course, not to be confused with the slogan of the I. W. W.: "The working class and the employing class have nothing in common." That slogan means that in the very nature of the case the two groups must continue to be antagonistic. One does not subscribe to such pessimism merely by recognizing the present facts. Perhaps one might say that a Christian faith with respect to industry is the confidence that employers and workers *may become* partners, although they are clearly not partners now.

Working Class "Psychology"

Royal Meeker, head of the Pennsylvania State Department of Labor, once said that the common talk about working-class psychology was quite misleading. The fact is, he said, that the psychology of the workers and of the employers is precisely the same, and that is what makes all the difficulty! In other words, the most conspicuous thing about industry to-day is the fact that a struggle is going on over a division of the product. It is perfectly patent, when one stops to think of it, that through cooperation the product of industry might be greatly increased and then the share of each group would be enlarged. But there are too much uncertainty and fear in the situation to permit such cooperation at the present time. The workers want some assurance that they are going to share in what they consider an equitable way in the division of the product before they exert themselves to increase it. The employer wants some assurance that too much of the increased product is not going to be taken

away from him. And both want to be assured that they are not going to be victims of a caprice of the market which every now and then brings about an industrial collapse.

How the Product of Industry Is Divided

Now, in an ordinary business the division of the product may be easily analyzed. Strictly speaking, the product of any business enterprise is divided into four parts: wages of labor, interest on capital, rent on land, and profits—that is, all that is left. In other words, the employer in the original sense of that term goes into the money market and gets his capital and pays for it the going rate of interest—let us say, five per cent on common stock and seven per cent on preferred stock. He goes into the so-called "labor market" and hires his labor for a stated wage. He pays a stated rent for his land, unless he buys it with the capital of the business. Then all that he makes over and above those fixed charges is his own share and is termed "profits." Ordinarily we do not distinguish between that part of a dividend which is strictly interest on capital invested and that part which is over and above the going rate of interest and which represents clear "velvet." There is no provision in the rules of the game as it is being played to-day for the settlement of fine moral questions like this. It is when such questions are raised that we hear the common slogan "Business is business." We are still under the spell of the economics formulated by Adam Smith, which put so much stress upon the workings of natural law. The division of the product of industry proceeds in accord with what are considered inexorable processes.

The Ethics of Business

Business and industry are, of course, not without their ethical code; there are practices that are taboo, and there are others that are "questionable" which all high-class concerns avoid. But the most fundamental issues in industry are settled by formulas that have little relation to ethics. For example, let us suppose that the price of an

important commodity suddenly goes up. There may be a good deal of talk about profiteering, but the business community in general asks only if the rise is proportional to the increase of demand over supply. The question of amount of profit is wholly secondary. Or suppose that wages have dropped to an abnormally low figure. The matter is dismissed as the natural result of a demand for labor that is low relatively to the supply. To ask less than the market price, or to pay more than the going wage, is considered a weird sort of philanthropy.

This whole arrangement which we accept as a matter of course seems a bit strange to one who has never acquired a business mind. A little girl of eight sat with her father in an "automat" lunch and, as she ate her sandwich, marveled at the number of nickels that poured through the slots of the machines. "I suppose," she said between bites, with a nod of her head toward the white figures pushing trays of dishes through the crowd, "I suppose they make a hundred dollars every day." She was assured that the nickels did not go to the employees, but that they only got their wages. The owner got the nickels. "Where is he?" she demanded and, on being told that he did not come to the place himself, she asked in amazement: "You mean that these people do the work and he stays home and counts his money? Why, daddy, that isn't right!" Her father did not follow her altogether in her primitive economics, but he coveted the ability of her unsophisticated little mind to arrive quickly at a moral judgment. "Out of the mouths of babes!"

The Law of Supply and Demand

An odd situation exists in industry to-day. Although the competitive struggle goes on over the division of the product, the orthodox view among employers is that such competition is essentially impossible. The prevailing economic doctrine on this point is that wages and prices are fixed by the "law of supply and demand" and that any arbitrary increase in wages is automatically passed on to the consumer. An actual reapportioning of the shares of capital and labor is not considered because the proportion

is assumed to be fixed by market conditions. The employer who distinguished his duty as a man from his duty as an employer was working on the prevailing theory that the division of the product of industry proceeds in accord with a mechanical principle. An English writer, R. H. Tawney, who is a churchman as well as an economist, has discussed this problem in a book suggestively called *The Sickness of an Acquisitive Society*.[1] He says of this conception of industry, "It produces industrial war, because its teaching is that each individual or group has a right to what they can get, and denies that there is any principle other than the mechanism of the market, which determines what they ought to get." That is it—"mechanism of the market." Business men and industrial leaders to-day are economic determinists in that they defer ultimately to mechanical laws instead of to spiritual principles. Now, of course, if they could prove that the mechanical laws actually do operate to the exclusion of spiritual principles, they would be right. That is to say, we should then have to agree that it is not a spiritual world we are living in but a mechanistic world. But the mechanical principles which are so stoutly defended keep the industrial world virtually an armed camp. The reason for this lies in the fact that they do not account adequately for all the elements of human nature.

Keeping People in Their Place

Of course, if all parties to industry would accept this mechanical interpretation of the matter, the industrial struggle might come to an end. But would that make things any better? One way to settle the slavery issue would have been to convince everyone that the slave had found his proper place, that he was a hewer of wood and a drawer of water because he was meant to be such. This doctrine was freely preached before the Civil War, and one frequently hears similar talk now. A woman who takes herself very seriously said to a companion in a fashionable New York club: "I think this universal edu-

[1] Page 40. The American title is *An Acquisitive Society*.

cation for the common people is a great mistake. It gets them quite dissatisfied with their state in life and unfits them for their proper work." Undoubtedly there are many people who still believe that the division of society into economic classes is ordained of God and that these very mechanical principles of which we have been speaking are the divinely appointed means of keeping things as they are. The orthodox Calvinist who had no difficulty in accepting the principle of predestination that required him to be "willing to be damned for the glory of God" certainly could have no difficulty as a capitalist and employer with the operation of a similar principle which determines every one's status and keeps him there. But would this be a Christian solution?

How the Law of Supply and Demand Works

But even if one has no moral difficulty with this situation, the practical trouble with it is that this much revered law of supply and demand seems to break down. A few hundred years ago the workers made up their minds that they would not accept the rule of the market, that they would not accept for themselves the status of a commodity, that they would increase by their own organized efforts the earnings which the law of supply and demand had assigned them. It is one of the common complaints of employers against labor unions that they interfere with the normal working of the labor market. Nevertheless, the labor unions have gone on and increased in strength. If they are here to stay—and there seems to be no doubt about it—we must accept this interference with the working of the law of supply and demand in the matter of wages as a continuing factor in the industrial situation until a spiritual solution of the industrial problem is found. In other words, trade unionism has put the workers into definite competition with employers and capitalists. When they ask for more wages, if the amount demanded can be added to the selling price, the employer is not concerned. But if the increase in wages must in some measure be taken out of profits or out of surplus, then the increased prosperity of labor can come

about only at the expense of the prosperity of the employer and the investors in the industry. Such demands are opposed by the employer with every force at his command. He considers them not only hostile to his interests but subversive of the fundamentals of economics.

Labor's "Cost of Production"

The basic difficulty here seems to be that an economic fact has been overlooked. All economists recognize that there are limits to the working of the law of supply and demand with reference to the prices of material goods. For instance, if the price of a commodity goes so low that it does not meet the "cost of production," the production stops. It is by changes in the volume of production that price changes are controlled—except where a monopoly exists. Now, if we think of labor as a commodity, and of wages as the price of it, what is the "cost of production" below which the "price" cannot go? Business men who have cost-accounting systems commonly leave out of the reckoning the true cost of labor. What they mean by labor cost is what they have to pay labor. What they overlook is that true labor cost is what it takes to keep labor healthy, efficient, and of wholesome mind. The law of supply and demand breaks down when used to justify low wages, just as it would with steel ingots, should one seek to apply it below the level of the cost of production. If labor is to be considered a commodity, then labor insists on having a price that will cover its cost. One is reminded of the argument over the possibility of curving a baseball. No matter how clearly mathematicians "proved" that a ball cannot be pitched on a curved line, the pitchers actually did it. They had hold of a physical principle that the scholars had forgotten. So in industry. No matter how much competition between wages and dividends is denied and pronounced fictitious, it goes on. Employers may assert that "artificial" interference with wage levels is contrary to economic laws, but the unions have continued to interfere and have obviously succeeded in influencing the ratio of wages to profits.

Who Wins in the Competitive Game?

So the competitive struggle in our industrial establishment continues. It is a very old game and a costly one. It goes on continually like the conflict between hostile nations. There may be protracted armed truces, but the war persists. The disturbing thing about all this is that the game we are playing, in its very nature, makes an escape from this situation impossible. It is a game that is never won and cannot be won by either side. Its goals are perpetually being shoved farther along. The ascendancy now of one side and now of the other is but a signal for the renewal of the struggle, an intensification of the competition, and a deepening of bitterness. To be sure, the opening stanza of Berton Braley's poem "Business Is Business"[1] depicts something cruder than we commonly find in the business world:

> "Business is Business," the Little Man said,
> "A battle where 'everything goes,'
> Where the only gospel is 'get ahead,'
> And never spare friends or foes.
> Slay or be slain' is the slogan cold;
> You must struggle and slash and tear,
> For Business is Business, a fight for gold,
> Where all that you do is fair!"

The process has been softened a good deal under the influence of Christian ideals. Yet this stanza much more closely approximates a description of modern business than the one that follows it:

> "Business is Business," the Big Man said,
> "A battle to make of earth
> A place to yield us more wine and bread,
> More pleasure and joy and mirth;
> There are still some bandits and buccaneers
> Who are jungle-bred beasts of trade,
> But their number dwindles with passing years,
> And dead is the code they made!"

The code they made seems to be far from dead. So long as attention is centered in both camps on the material rewards of industrial effort, so long as both employers and

[1] Used by permission of *The Nation's Business*.

workers are actuated by fear of each other and of the unpredictable workings of the market, there is no escape from the crudities of the struggle. We may dignify work all we like and idealize industry as much as we please, but human beings who live in the hunger zone or just beyond the edge of it are not likely to climb much above the plane of animal self-defense. Yet if Christian faith has any sure foundation, the time is coming when it may be said truly of this competitive regime, "Dead is the code they made."

Men and Things

Here, then, is the stern fact. Employers and business men are committed for the most part to reliance upon the workings of the law of supply and demand. To a very considerable degree that law actually operates in industry. But it operates to produce discontent and rebellion. It is a mechanical principle evolved with reference to things. It will never work, undisputed, with reference to men. Labor has discovered that by use of its own economic power it can interfere with the operation of the law of supply and demand. By organizing, labor can defy the dictates of the "labor market" precisely as employers by combining can force their prices away beyond the normal level fixed by the operation of this law. It is a commonplace of economics that the law of supply and demand does not work for monopolies. Employers have learned how to limit its operation in their own interest and workers have learned likewise. The mechanical principles have been challenged on both sides when the interest of either group has called for it. Hereafter neither group can invoke them with impunity merely to gain an advantage over the other. The actual visible rewards of industry are at present limited and the contest is over their distribution. The old competitive game is a harsh one, but is there any other game to play? Christianity holds that there is.

For the Discussion Group

Do you agree with the statement that the difficulty in

industrial relations is less a matter of misunderstanding than of a very clear understanding of conflicting interests?

What are the interests of capital and labor which so often pit them against each other? Do increased wages necessarily mean less profits, or higher prices to the consumer? Can the interests of all three parties be advanced at the same time? How?

Do the employers whom you know generally accept "supply and demand" as the principle of wage determination? How far would the average employer go in cutting wages when the "labor market" is strongly favorable to him?

What do the words "right" and "just" mean when applied to wages? Are they ethical or only mathematical terms?

Are there fixed levels of intelligence which qualify people for stated kinds of work? If so, who or what is to determine where people "belong"?

Is industry as much interested in the "upkeep" of its labor as in that of its plant and equipment? If an employer can figure his material "costs," why is there no agreement about what it costs to maintain labor in physical and mental efficiency?

Are disputes over wages and hours usually settled or only patched up? Some people insist that they cannot be settled on a continuing competitive basis. What do you think?

Is there something wrong with the competitive game itself, or only with the way it is played?

CHAPTER VI

STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS—INTERRUPTIONS OF THE GAME

1 Corinthians 12. 14-27

Are strikes and lockouts ever justifiable? Whether justifiable or not, are they inevitable? What right has a man to his job? Is the remedy for strikes to be found in compulsory arbitration or in some less drastic means? Must there always be an ultimate appeal to force in the preservation of human rights and institutions? If so, what becomes of the Christian ideal?

The Diagnosis

Many of the bodily pains and annoyances that human beings suffer are of interest to the doctors chiefly for the light they throw on conditions of greater importance. Most of us are blissfully unaware of our disorders until some purely superficial sign develops. Then, but for the counsel of a wise physician, we should probably become preoccupied with the symptom and neglect the real trouble. Is there any significance in this for the present-day industrial situation? Certainly we are caught unprepared for most of the conflicts that break out. Take the great coal strike of 1922 for example. The roots of that trouble were deep and it had been growing for years. It was the whole industry that was out of gear, not just the mechanism of bargaining. Yet it took months of educational work and publicity to convince the public that the trouble was not just a matter to be adjusted by arbitration over wages. This time the public became sufficiently aroused to warrant Congress in setting up new machinery at considerable expense to find the facts and devise remedies for what was wrong. As a general rule, however, it is hardly too much to say that so long

as the wheels keep turning, the public is indifferent to industrial questions. Apparently the work of the Coal Commission was all but forgotten by the country at large when the anthracite crisis of 1923 brought the matter once again into the foreground. The public is preoccupied with its own affairs—that is, with what it recognizes as its own affairs—and it requires a very considerable disturbance to direct its attention to the problems of any one group of people.

Symptoms and Causes

It is precisely because of our neglect of industrial affairs that the outbreaks of trouble and violence are of so great importance. Like the symptoms of approaching bodily disaster which the doctors value, strikes and lockouts are like big signal boards on the industrial highway. The quack doctor attempts only to treat the symptoms and lets the causes take care of themselves. There is a story of a new fireman in a powder factory who was told to keep his eye on the thermometer because if it went beyond a certain point he would "hear a noise around here." His foreman came just in time to see him dousing the thermometer with cold water. Is it possible that the often heard proposal to prohibit strikes by law would be merely applying cold water to the industrial thermometer?

But since, on the one hand, labor makes much of the "right to strike," and, on the other hand, the strike itself is considered by many people to be one of the chief evils of the present situation, it ought to be carefully examined. And in no other way can one get a better understanding of the problems of industrial relations. On the face of it the strike is a drastic weapon and quite contrary to the Christian ideal. Yet the matter cannot be disposed of so easily.

"Seniority"

At the height of the railroad shopmen's strike in 1922 one of the present writers undertook to interpret the seniority issue in a statement which came to the attention of many persons of very decided views on the labor ques-

tion. Seniority means the preference in lay-off and rehiring, pensions and other privileges, that is accorded on the basis of length of service. The statement pointed out that this set of privileges is so important a factor in the worker's status that if it were surrendered by the striking shopmen, not only would their strike be lost but their union would be virtually destroyed. In other words, if men could not strike without losing all claim to their jobs and having to go back as individuals—if an employee of twenty years' service had to accept a status inferior to that of a strike breaker who two months before was not even in the craft—then all that the union means in the shape of economic protection would be taken away.

The Title to a Job

This statement drew criticism. One university professor said that it was unsound from a moral point of view—it suggested that a man might quit his job and still lay claim to it, that he might retain his right to a job although refusing to work at it. On what ethical ground could such a position be maintained? At first sight the argument seems conclusive. We are all inclined to apply to such a situation the moral of the "dog-in-the-manger" story. And besides, the suggestion that a man's job can be anything other than a matter of contractual relationship between him as an individual and his employer cuts across a very strong legal tradition. The earlier history of the labor movement abounds in examples of court decisions holding illegal any collective attempt to interfere with that relationship. But this is precisely the point at issue with reference to the strike. The labor union is a modern social phenomenon, and the strike likewise. However we may be disposed to regard it, is it not plain that in the collective refusal of workmen to work save under certain conditions we have a new kind of situation, one not contemplated in our older legal canons and not quite accounted for in our accepted moral codes?

At its best, leaving out cases of violation of law or contract, the strike is precisely the thing that the professor pronounced morally impossible—quitting a job and still

laying claim to it. It is the insistence that the workman has a moral claim to his job, just as the employer has to his factory, and that he has the same right to refuse temporarily to work because of conditions which he believes to be wrong that the employer has to lock his factory temporarily if unwilling to accept the workers' terms. The workers consider their jobs as their property and they have no difficulty in justifying the use of aggressive tactics in defending them.

Resorting to Violence

It must be admitted that the violent acts of strikers make a cumulative indictment whose seriousness the responsible leaders of labor fully recognize. Probably the most bitter attacks of employers, and even of those paid publicity representatives of employers' associations who sometimes have too little conscience about the tales which they disseminate, have a rather definite basis in fact, however exaggerated they may be when considered quantitatively. Yet all such deeds are strictly comparable to what the average man does when his back is against the wall in the defense of the thing most precious to him. Probably a conviction could seldom be had in the case of a man who used violence upon another who entered in hostile fashion his place of business, regardless of what a truly Christian judgment of his act might be. What is the counterpart of this property right in the life of the workman? There is but one answer—his job. And the worker displays toward that job, which he considers his property, the same fierce jealousy that characterizes the property-owner's attitude toward his possessions. Who touches a man's job touches his life.

Horrible and unjustifiable as was the Herrin massacre, its explanation is doubtless to be found in this fundamental attitude of workingmen. They go mad and act like brutes over the right to a job. A union town imparts to its children a bitterness toward the nonunion worker —the "scab," the Philistine—that is comparable to the hereditary bitterness toward Germany that Alsatians imbibed with their mothers' milk. It is reported that in a

West Virginia town the school children recently refused to attend the school because the school building was being heated with coal from a mine that was worked by non-union men. The pupils went on strike.

What the Liberal Employer Thinks

It would be quite untrue to say that employers in general deny the claim of the workers to a "vested interest" in their jobs. They probably would for the most part reject it, stated in this way, but nevertheless many employers are coming to feel that service rendered to the industry is something like capital invested in it and constitutes a definite claim on the part of the worker. The president of one of the great roads involved in the strike to which we have just referred took the men's view of this matter and refused to join his fellow executives in insisting that the men give up their seniority rights. But even employers who are inclined to take a liberal view of the matter are usually very easily convinced that the worker's claim has been invalidated by disloyal conduct.

The Idealism of a Strike

Perhaps it involves some stretch of the imagination on the part of a person who looks at labor troubles from a distance to find anything idealistic in a strike. But a careful observer will find in a great labor struggle a loyalty and sacrifice that are akin to patriotism or even to religious devotion. Again and again men have sacrificed their jobs, have suffered eviction from their homes and ostracism from their associates, because of a conviction that a moral principle was involved in their strike. Women and children have joined in the struggle as they would participate in a religious crusade. And in the fires thus kindled the leaders of labor are forged. If they are belligerent and noncooperative, probably this background of struggle is responsible. Even though the evil of a strike may be admitted, labor regards the effort to suppress it by law as a forcible disarming of one combatant while the other is left in possession of his weapons. No one can deal with the labor strike who does not see in it a

large measure of idealism and righteous purpose, however he may appraise it in a particular situation.

Compulsory Arbitration

The proposal that strikes be prohibited by law and arbitration made compulsory is rigidly opposed by labor. Without the strike as a potential resort labor feels that it would be utterly inferior in bargaining power to the employing and financial interests which have undisputed physical control of the plant. It interprets compulsory arbitration to mean compulsory labor. An attempt has been made in Kansas to outlaw strikes, with a degree of success which remains a matter of dispute. But it has served to bring out sharply the opposition to the principle of arbitrary control. Industrial war is closely analogous to international war. The establishment of courts of both industrial and international justice having compulsory jurisdiction may probably be regarded as an ultimate certainty, but such tribunals presuppose an impartial code of law such as does not exist to-day. Of course the parallel between a labor strike and armed conflict between nations is far from complete. Quantitatively the evils are not to be compared. Yet there are inherent in the strike all the terrors of a hunger blockade. At the same time labor prefers to accept the responsibility for using reason and moderation in the exercise of this grave alternative rather than to submit to the decision of a public which in a crisis usually thinks first of its own convenience and last of the justice of labor's claims. If the strike is a hard thing for the public to understand, the public's attitude toward a strike is an equally hard thing for labor to understand. Labor is told continually that the public's interest is primary and that the public's will must be done. But labor feels that the public interest is sometimes best served by temporarily disturbing the public's convenience.

Labor and the Courts

One of the most regrettable facts in the industrial situation is labor's distrustful attitude toward the courts. Were that attitude different, the "right to strike" would

doubtless be less tightly grasped. Often it is based on a prejudice that one might call blind were it not so characteristically human. But there is a considerable ground for it which cannot be ignored. Take, for example, the decision handed down in the spring of 1923 by the United States Supreme Court on the Minimum Wage Commission Law in the District of Columbia. One need only turn to Mr. Chief Justice Taft's vigorous dissenting opinion to understand labor's grievance against the courts. Mr. Taft said, in effect, that the court departed from its proper function by arguing economics instead of confining itself to the law and the Constitution. But for his judicial temperament and capacity he might have said much more.

The basic necessity in Christianizing industrial relations would seem to be the establishment of mutual confidence and respect, and dependence upon justice rather than force. Jesus made much of this principle. But how can either side be sure that the legislative or judicial body to which final appeal must be made is going to be governed by a disinterested desire to do justly? Injunctions have been issued again and again when the deciding factor has not been the law or the constitution but popular clamor, or even the play of some strong special interest.

Force as the Last Resort

Labor's attitude commonly takes its temper from the economic force in the background, and hence, from the idealistic point of view, there is a fundamental fallacy in the prevailing labor philosophy. One of the writers once remarked to a labor leader that from the churches' point of view the ultimate question is always one of right. He replied with a smile, "From my point of view, it is a question of munitions"—that is to say, economic resources for a struggle. There is much of this force psychology in the labor movement. And one need only follow the history of a conflict like the great steel strike of 1919 to know that the employers likewise depend chiefly on force to bring them victory in such a contest—force not always limited to economic compulsion, but sometimes extending

to physical violence, in order to overpower the leaders of a strike. They very generally employ secret service and private police, and they seek in a variety of ways to secure control of the civic power. One of the chief uses of a financial surplus is the financing of recurring fights with labor. The difference between labor and employers in a hotly contested battle is a question of the resources available at the moment. What is perhaps most to the point is that scarcely any person or group is to-day free from this force psychology. Force is still the main dependence of nations. Governments that do not count in terms of gunboats and battalions get relatively small consideration from powerful nations. Some trust in chariots and some in horses; few remember the name of the Lord.

This is the background against which we are attempting to construct a Christian ideal. It would have been simpler to prescribe counsels of perfection from the Sermon on the Mount. That we have not done so here is no indication of a lack of faith in the complete sufficiency and ultimate triumph of those principles. Rather it is because the industrial world seems at this moment to need plans and specifications more than absolute ethical precepts. From the Christian point of view it has an architect: it needs a builder.

For the Discussion Group

Who is mainly responsible for the hundreds of strikes that occur yearly—the workers themselves, their leaders, or the employers? Or is the responsibility evenly divided?

Is a man's right to his job on the same plane as an owner's right to his property? Is your answer based on law, on ethics, or on both?

Is a strike always an evil? Is it sometimes the lesser of two evils?

Is a strike on a public utility—a railroad, for example—ever justified? If so, under what circumstances? What about a strike of policemen or firemen? What is the governing principle?

If one holds that all strikes are unjustifiable acts on the part of labor, is he thereby required, logically, to hold

that the use of force in general is wrong? Must an industrial pacifist be a political pacifist? What is the effect on the industrial situation of our continued reliance on force in international relations? Are the two cases parallel?

Is compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes a right policy on the part of the community? Which side has most to lose by it? Are employers more friendly to this method than workers?

If the community limits the "right to strike" on the part of workers employed on public utilities, is it under obligation to make some special provision for the safeguarding of their interests? If so, what sort of safeguard would you suggest?

CHAPTER VII

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP IN INDUSTRY—THE NEW GAME

Matthew 7. 24-27; Romans 12. 4-8

Is the desire for fellowship as fundamental in human nature as the pursuit of private gain or advantage? Can the business of producing and distributing the goods of the world be made a fellowship of service? That is to say, can industry be made as fundamentally Christian as a missionary enterprise? Or can we only hope to lop off here and there the crudities of our competitive regime? What does Christianity mean for the industrial world itself—for its aims, its ideals, its processes?

The Quest of the Christian Ideal

We have reached the middle of our course and have not yet attempted to define a Christian ideal for industry. This has been quite intentional on the writers' part for the reason that this course is not an attempt to superimpose a set of principles or ideals upon the industrial world. It is rather an attempt to work out a problem in the light of Christian ideals. Much has been written on the social ideals of Christianity that has been helpful as an interpretation of the mind of Christ and of the Christian community, but for the most part neither employers nor workers have been inclined to take idealistic writing seriously. To be sure, an increasing number of employers are making an attempt at applying what they consider Christian principle—and sometimes specifically in terms of the Golden Rule—to their business and industrial relationships, but the problem still remains of determining what, specifically, the Golden Rule means. Ethical progress cannot be made by securing formal assent to prin-

ciples save as these principles are made increasingly operative in concrete situations.

What Is Christianity?

In the chapters that have preceded we have been trying to find ourselves in the struggle of the industrial world; to understand the problems of every group concerned in industry so that out of the struggle itself we may find our way to some ethical judgments. Are we ready now to state somewhat definitely what Christianity means as applied to industrial relations? The obvious and often-heard answer is that the only thing necessary in industry is that all employers and workers should be converted to Christianity. That is, of course, from our point of view, strictly true, but what are we going to say concerning the employers and labor leaders who are among the most active professors of Christianity, and in no hypocritical sense, but who nevertheless are among the most active sources of industrial discontent? Employers and business men who are pious in their professions and devout in their practices and whose interest in religion is beyond question are nevertheless sometimes found in the front ranks of disturbers of the industrial peace.

Redemption of the World Versus Escape From It

Is not all this due to the fact that Christianity has been misconceived as to its essentials? Its application to business and industry is considered to be incidental and secondary. The heart of Christianity is taken to be preparation for another kind of world than that in which we live rather than the transformation of the world we live in, so that it will be the kind of world that Christian nurture prepares one for. Perhaps the drama of *The Pilgrim's Progress* has influenced our minds so much that we have difficulty in thinking of Christianity as a program of redemption. We tend, rather, to think of it as a means of release from life in an essentially evil world. In the early days of Christianity the church was thought of in the figure of an ark of salvation, and the suggestion

always carried by that figure is one of escape from a world which is so bad that it is only fit for destruction. But those who talk of social salvation and a gospel for industry read the New Testament otherwise. They find in it a promise of redemption for the world itself. They believe that if human nature is individually redeemable, then human institutions and relationships must also be redeemable.

It is our view that the chief purpose which Jesus came to further was the building of a spiritual brotherhood inclusive of all mankind, and that the central thing, therefore, in Christianity is the ideal and the practice of fellowship. Our task is to erect this spiritual structure against the background of struggle and bitterness upon which we have been looking. Perhaps we might state it in this way: that we are seeking a world, not of warring groups but of cooperating groups; that the aim of life is to secure from every person and every group the greatest contribution in service of which he is capable; that everybody has a stake in what everybody else does. It is a new kind of game in which the goal is not to overcome other human beings but to conquer nature and to master life in the interest of all men.

The Uses of Conflict

History seems to show that groups of human beings attain harmony of action through struggle. Conflict is itself a part of the process of socialization. Why should it be considered necessarily bad in itself? Its evil consists in a failure to issue in something higher. In a given stage of political life it may be said that war is inevitable, and the same may be said about strife in industry. But the purpose of conflict is served only as it renders future conflict less inevitable. No careful observer of the labor movement can fail to be impressed with the spiritual quality of labor's struggle and sacrifice for a higher status and greater freedom. The encounter with employers and with owners has often had an unquestionable spiritual value. There are moral tasks to be done in the world that cannot be done with gloves. Is not the test of conflict

on the ethical side the degree to which it removes barriers to future fellowship among men?

All this is said in full recognition that labor's struggles are often as crass as those of predatory interests. The difference is in the result. By and large, must we not admit that labor's struggles have issued in a broader basis for fellowship, and a more universal concept of citizenship? The employers likewise have had their costly experience of conflict—among themselves as well as against the labor movement. Even where they have not had justice on their side they have perhaps paid the inevitable price of a broader vision and a greater service.

Fellow Victims

Might it not be said that the parties now struggling with each other in industry are not so much mutual antagonists as fellow victims of a regime of force and struggle? It was frequently remarked during the Great War that its tragedy was enhanced by the fact that men fought each other like tigers who had no personal grievance; who, left to themselves, and freed from the gigantic mechanism of destruction, would fraternize and become friends. Likewise it is often observed that representatives of employing and labor interests meet on the same platform and exchange warm personal greetings, although in their official capacities they fight bitterly. There is a fellowship even in hostile combat; the combatants may be together paying the price of future freedom.

The Higher Conflict

Scholarly writers have been objecting in recent years to the many programs of betterment that have been brought forward by social idealists because they say that humanity would not be satisfied in a world where there was nothing or nobody left to fight. But is this not like leaving a youth surrounded by whisky fumes and typhoid germs and licentious literature so that he may have something wherewith to develop manly resistance? To remove the necessity of struggle on the low levels of life frees one's mental and moral energies for struggle on the higher

levels. We have the whole intellectual and moral world to conquer; why spend our energies in conflict with one another? Theodore Roosevelt once said to a crowd of ministers of different faiths: "You have a big target to shoot at. I hope you will not waste your ammunition shooting at each other."

Let us ask, if the Christian ideal of fellowship were actually regnant in the world, how industrial activities and relationships would be modified.

A Job for Everybody

Are we not safe in saying at the outset that if there is anything in the ideal of human fellowship or brotherhood with reference to industry, such an ideal would mean in the first place that everybody should work? This means, of course, everybody in good health between the age limits of productive labor. Incidentally it would also imply employment so far as possible for the handicapped, in order that they might not be denied the satisfaction of work, which human beings seem normally to require. The provision for productive industrial employment of men who are maimed by the loss of a limb or the loss of sight, for example, makes possible the retention of what might be called free industrial citizenship for many who would otherwise be dependent and suffer the demoralizing consequences of pauperdom. Henry Ford's plants appear to have accomplished almost unbelievable results in this direction by finding jobs for the maimed that they can do just as well as those not handicapped at all. Our industrial rehabilitation law and the machinery of its operation have unmeasured spiritual value. But we are chiefly concerned with the able-bodied men and women who make up our communities. During the war we applied a "work or fight" principle, which was given the force of law, if not by statute, at least by public opinion. One nation, Bulgaria, has undertaken to make a certain amount of work compulsory in time of peace.

Hoboes—Both Kinds

It is easy enough to enforce such a regulation at the

lower end of the industrial ladder, but what about the vagrants in automobiles and on horseback? Should not a rule that works for a ragged hobo work likewise for a well-dressed one? And what about the young woman whose occupation appears on a legal report blank as "at home"? Are there women vagrants of the indoor variety? If the young woman is "at home" because she has a job there, of course the case is different. But it is hard to reconcile with the Christian ideal living on income that one does nothing to earn.

Judging a Job

But surely this ideal is concerned with what one works *at*. For there are many things commonly done that we cannot imagine Jesus doing—or even Martin Luther or John Wesley. Certain of them we should all agree on, probably, at the mere mention of them—running a low-class amusement house, for example, or a pawnshop; likewise, gambling, whether big or little. But then there comes a long list of things about which there may be a great difference of opinion. A man was heard to say recently that he could not engage in the jewelry business because he thought it was not productive, and hence not socially justifiable. He is in the business of making farm implements. Certainly, the latter is much more essential, closer to the actual needs of humanity than the former. Yet many would feel that jewelry may be in a very real sense "goods," and that this adverse judgment was too sweeping. Well, then, what about chewing gum or tobacco? Clearly, we could never agree on all the specific instances that we might name, but could we perhaps agree on a general principle? That principle might be stated thus: that the purpose of all work is to render a service, to enrich the lives of human beings—both those who do the work and those who consume the product—and that no consideration of profit or reward justifies a business that cannot meet this test.

The Doom of the Useless

Such a proposition cuts across at once the often ex-

pressed idea that whatever gives employment to labor is a justifiable enterprise provided it is not positively harmful. For example, here is a cosmetics establishment. No one argues that cosmetics rank high as economic goods, and probably most of us would list them, in our most serious and honest moments, among the dispensable things for which there is nevertheless a very pronounced demand. But, barring compounds that are injurious, many people would say that so long as such goods can be sold and their manufacture employs thousands of laborers, no further question need be asked. Nevertheless, our economists are telling us to-day that another very important question needs to be asked—namely, what *good* does the article in question do? Now, many will be found to assure us that this particular class of goods plays a very important part in life. Perhaps so; but the point here is that every industry or business should be able to defend itself not merely from the charge of harmfulness but from the charge of uselessness. Is not this a Christian principle? Every branch that bears no fruit must be cut down. The men and women employed in a nonproductive industry might be employed in a productive one. Money paid for that which is not bread might as well have been thrown into the sea. Perhaps one of the most fruitful things that Christians, particularly Christian young people, could do is to consider and compare all sorts of occupations as to their relative usefulness, not only with reference to entering them but with reference to encouraging them with their investments.

What Is Wrong in Industry?

But assuming that we have everybody at work doing something recognized as useful, the fact remains that the industries in which most of the trouble occurs are those of unquestioned usefulness and importance—coal mining, steel making, garment making, railroads, building, for example. Why is it that such essential processes do not go on in harmony and peace? The Christian diagnosis is that there is no fellowship in them.

Now, this word "fellowship," like the word "love," is

likely to be interpreted to mean something very conventional and, it is to be feared, very impractical and unreal. But consider a moment. Is it not the very thing that employers are constantly talking about when they tell their workingmen that industry is a partnership, and that capital and labor cannot be in conflict because their interests are identical? Is not the thing that Christianity offers the very thing that industrial leaders want and imagine they can secure by simply getting workers to accept a formula? And all the time the workers are convinced that there is no partnership but, rather, essential conflict, because, as matters stand, the interests of the two groups are not identical but in sharp contrast.

Under-Cover Idealism

Is it not very illuminating that the words which are central to our Christian religion—love, fellowship, good will, service—should be considered a bit out of place in the business world? The war brought us some rare examples of these virtues, but the vocabulary was different. Brotherhood was summed up in the term "buddy." The supreme sacrifice was "going west." Idealism there was aplenty, but men scorned its conventional names. So in industry, even if a man does a fine thing for his employees, he wants it known as "straight business."

This suppression of idealistic motives is in accord with what seems to be a general agreement that when "sentiment" gets into business, either someone is a hypocrite or someone is going broke. Christianity cuts straight across this theory. It aims to put social motives at the center, not at the periphery of life; to build upon the foundation of consciousness of kind and identity of interest that is being laid by means of a struggle and conflict in the industrial world, until its travail shall issue in a new brotherhood from which no individual or group shall be excluded.

For the Discussion Group

Are we interested in Christianity primarily because of what it offers in private spiritual satisfactions and future

hopes, or because it promises a redeemed world? *Does* it promise a redeemed world, or only escape from the world?

It is related of Wendell Phillips that when asked if he considered that Christianity had failed he replied, "I don't know; it has never been tried." Do you agree with him?

Think of the most generous and public-minded employers and business men in the community; now run over in your mind the most religious men, the most devoted to the church and its activities; are they the same people in each case? If not, why not? If the majority of industrial leaders are Christians, why is industry not yet Christianized?

Is fellowship a major or a minor fact in life? Which does the average person care more for—his private possessions and interests or the approval of his fellows and the enjoyment of their society?

Assuming that it is generally agreed that every able-bodied person ought to work, should the state tax idleness, or should the matter be left to moral suasion?

What is the relative merit, from the Christian point of view, of the tobacco industry? the diamond industry? munitions? books? victrolas? locomotives? flowers?

Is it unchristian to engage in producing something that it would be unchristian to use?

In the world as it is to-day can any idealistic young person find a lifework that squares fully with his ideals?

CHAPTER VIII

NEW MOTIVES FOR OLD—THE GOAL OF THE GAME

Luke 2. 49; 1 Corinthians 3. 9-15

WHAT is the strongest incentive to physical and mental effort? Must it be assumed that even a Christian man is dominated by enlightened self-interest in the sphere of his trade, business, or profession? Is the Golden Rule a counsel of perfection, having reality only in a supernatural world, or is it to be taken seriously with reference to life as it is? Is human nature essentially selfish; and if so, can it be changed?

CHRISTIANITY IN BUSINESS—ASSET OR HANDICAP?

A few years ago a group of prominent persons in an Eastern city were discussing in a prayer meeting the old question, Can a man be a Christian and succeed in business? One very thoughtful man, an employer of labor, said that he was sure the answer was Yes; but he was inclined to think that a Christian could not make as much money in business as a man who made no Christian profession. In other words, being a Christian was, as a New York politician once said of being a Presbyterian in Tammany Hall, "something of a handicap." This was quite to the point, whether or not one agrees with the sentiment expressed. But the most interesting comment came from a lawyer who said, "Of course one can be a Christian and succeed in business; if not, then there must be something wrong with Christianity." It did not occur to him that there might be something wrong with business. It is to be feared that most of us when we find principles out of line with practice make a strenuous effort first to warp the principles.

But is there not a sense in which the lawyer was right?

That is to say, whatever we may think of this or that phase of the modern world of business or industry or politics, no system of morals that will not meet the requirements of a crowded world of human beings can long sustain itself. If it is not possible to produce goods and consume them, to marry and be given in marriage, and to do all the other elemental things that are necessary to our common life in a way that is fully reconcilable with our ethical ideals, are we not really under the necessity of frankly confessing that our ideals are impossible of realization in this world and of finding a new set of ideals that are in accord with life as it has to be lived? For instance, we have discarded the monastic ideal of life because it doesn't work. If it should be discovered that a Christian ideal for industry would not produce the goods we need to live on, doubtless we should all agree that our ideal needed adjustment to reality.

The Test of the Golden Rule

Sooner or later we have to face this problem. Everybody agrees that if there is a Christian ideal for industrial relations it is built up around the idea of service, of cooperation. But a large part of the working world seems to be quite convinced that no such ideal will work. "It is all very well," we hear men say, "for personal and private relations, but you can't conduct a business on that basis." An official in an industrial concern who was also an active churchman recently said, "It probably ought to be the kind of world in which business and industry can be conducted according to the Golden Rule, but it isn't." Thus we come to have two systems of ethics, one for personal and private relations and another for our corporate relations and responsibilities. And we do not seem to have any difficulty in squaring both codes with a Christian profession. Does not this remind one unpleasantly of the German professor's remark that the commandment to love your neighbor is without doubt binding in individual relationships, but that "for a German to love a Frenchman as himself is the political sin against the Holy Ghost!" It is hard to see why such a doctrine is any

worse when applied to international than when applied to industrial relations.

The difficulty here seems to be that most of us assume that human affairs are commonly carried on for reasons that cannot be justified from the Christian point of view; that the world is not only unsanctified but unsanctifiable. It may be worth while to inquire whether the world of practical affairs is as bad as all that, whether human nature is so dismally unregenerate that it takes a war or other great catastrophe to release noble motives. What, after all, is it that induces people to play their part in the game of life?

Why Work?

After all, why do we work? Why does anybody work? It is true that we work just because it is a way to get food, clothing, and shelter? Samuel Johnson is reputed to have said that if he hadn't been hungry, he never would have written a book. But certainly there are multitudes of people who are not obliged, economically, to work who nevertheless prefer to be constantly employed. The sons of wealthy men are often among the hardest workers. In the last few years we have heard much about "instincts in industry" and the "instinct of workmanship." It is a fair question whether people of normal health and intelligence do not work because it is in them to work, because they would be "lost without it." A certain metropolitan suburb has a large plot of ground devoted to "community gardens," where plots are assigned to any residents of the community who want them. Many people who work all day in the city take two and three garden plots and put in some of the hardest work of the summer on them with only an incidental money reward. Physicians tell us that among women who are not habitually gainfully employed the most serious kinds of nervous disorders develop just because of the lack of wholesome employment. We seem to require something to throw ourselves into, to identify ourselves with. Commonly money reward is taken as the measure of success in business, industry, or profession. But is that equivalent to saying

that men work primarily for material gain? Men who have acquired all the money they need tend to think in other terms—building up a business to leave behind them, or making a record in volume or skill of achievement, discovery, or invention.

Here is something interesting to speculate upon: Suppose everyone were provided with all the natural necessities of life, what would people do? Would they go on working just the same or would most people take a grand lay-off? If they would take the lay-off, if human nature is like that, then it would seem rather hopeless to pursue the quest of a Christian ideal for industry. For it is rather hard to imagine a Christian attitude toward work on the part of creatures who are so made that they would not work if they did not have to.

Salvation in Work

Dr. Richard Cabot in a well-known book answers the question "what men live by" with a fourfold prescription: work, play, love, and worship. According to this philosophy, work is an end in itself. That is to say, apart from the social end that industry serves, it is to the men and women who participate in it a fulfillment of their own natures. And if this is true, the ideal held by many people, that the goal of all work is to reach a position where they will not have to work, is quite erroneous. The notion sometimes advanced by labor leaders that the industrial emancipation of the world is to be found in fewer hours of work and correspondingly more leisure would likewise, from this point of view, be far from correct. For, according to the view of work we have been considering, we should look for the salvation of the world *in* its work, not in escape from it.

Altruism

But a person may be very industrious without being very useful. He may spend many valuable hours perfecting his private radio with no conspicuous benefit resulting to the community. One needs only to look into the Gospels to make up his mind that whatever the Chris-

tian ideal may be in detail, it demands that the motive of all work shall be that of service to one's fellows. To be sure, altruism sometimes becomes a sort of negative affair. A small boy in a philosophical mood once asked his mother, "What are we here for?" to which she replied in conventional phrase "To help others, my son." He contracted his brows over this reply and presently came back with "And what are the others here for?" We have to find a motive that includes ourselves and others too. There is nothing ascetic about the social ideal of living. We do not have to be immolating ourselves perpetually after we have found ourselves in fellowship.

"Not in Business for Our Health"

Admittedly this service ideal is far from regnant in the world to-day. The majority of people probably would say that they are working for the money they can make and that no one can be expected to work hard without a proportionate money reward. "We are not in business for our health." It is generally assumed that people will not work unless driven to it by need; that no one will invest his money in an enterprise unless he is reasonably certain that it is the best-paying safe proposition that he can find. Yet there are few people who actually live down to the level of that crude statement. In fact, many a person deliberately chooses an employment that is not as lucrative as others because of what it means in terms of service. And money is often invested in an enterprise that yields small financial returns but large rewards of a non-material sort. Many a corporation deliberately limits its earnings in order to pay better wages or in order to play fair with its customers. A bank has been known to resist the most tempting rates of interest when a moral principle was at stake. An employer often makes concessions to his workers to his own financial loss. But to cite such examples is to emphasize their comparative rareness. The principle of industry for service is not established in the world; in fact, it is very definitely opposed. There are men of good character, judged by all the common stand-

ards, who resist the notion that industry can be conducted on an idealistic basis.

What Is Industry For?

A minister once wrote a criticism of the Interchurch report on the steel strike in which he insisted that the purpose of the steel industry is to produce steel, and hence he scoffed at many human issues that were raised in the Interchurch report. But suppose we analyze that a bit. Obviously the reason why our industrial plants have come into being is the necessity for material goods. Assuming that the goods in question are real goods that actually enrich life, then surely it is reasonable to insist that any idealistic proposal for industrial reorganization must deliver the goods. And it is not sufficient that individuals may be found here and there who are willing to run their factories without profit during a period of depression, inspiring as that sight may be. The ultimate test is a practical one. Can business men everywhere be induced to run their enterprises for service all the time, and can they make a success on that basis? Of course a man may be so unselfish that he will run his business at a loss. It may well be argued that unless a man actually prefers to run his business at a loss rather than to violate the Christian ideal he is unworthy of the great Christian adventure of life. But let us face the facts. If the Christian ideal means to run business at a loss, the Christian ideal will run into the ground. We are brought right back to where our lawyer friend left us, although the question as he put it revealed, perhaps, a rather questionable motive. Is it not true that in industry as elsewhere Christianity must be judged by its fruits?

The Quest of Incentives

Many people seriously believe that the old game of competitive strife will produce more and better goods in the long run than the method of cooperation and the motive of service; they feel, though they would not say

so, that Christianity is a religion for the cloister rather than for practical life. But most people who take this view will not follow it to the logical conclusion. They take the easy course and give lip service to the higher ideal and during six days of the week frankly follow the lower. And it must be admitted that the practicability of the Christian ideal has never been fully demonstrated. Yet it is susceptible of proof. The great question facing the Christian community to-day is a scientific question: Is the Christian ideal practicable as a way of life? If not, then Bunyan's pilgrim was right from his point of view. He wanted to live in a good world and he decided to run for it. But if Christianity can be made a science of practical living, then what we want is Christian engineers and employers and labor leaders who will build a new industrial order wherein will dwell righteousness.

"Human Nature Cannot Be Changed"

Those who take the pessimistic view of this problem commonly base their objections on the ground that to displace self-interest as the controlling factor in life means to "change human nature"—and that can't be done! Is it not a bit strange to hear Christian men and women talking that way? They take the regeneration of the individual life for granted, but they do not see the possibility of a regeneration of human relationships. Man is made in the image of God, but the world he lives in is a bad world and the Almighty himself cannot redeem it! Is that not a bit preposterous?

It is related of Dr. Josiah Strong, one of the earliest of the present generation of apostles of a Christian social order, that after he had on a certain occasion addressed a group of ministers, one of them rose and flung at him the old pessimistic objection. "Don't you realize," he said, "that the idealistic program you have been presenting would require a complete change of human nature?" Doctor Strong was on his feet in a second. "Precisely so," he replied, "and it was to men like you that Jesus said, 'Ye must be born again.'"

The Dawn of Morality

There is nothing unscientific in the belief that mutual service rather than self-interest will prove to be the most powerful motive in the life of the world. How did the moral sense of mankind develop in the first place? We are all familiar with the principle of the struggle for existence which biologists hold to be responsible for the evolution of life along definite lines. We can easily account for muscular strength, keenness of sight, and fleetness of foot on the basis of struggle between individuals because these traits aided the individual in the competition for survival. But how did morality come to have a "survival value"? Tennyson refers to the struggle for existence in his memorable lines:

> "Though nature, red in tooth and claw,
> With ravine, shrieked against his creed."

Where do altruism, service, sacrifice fit into such a process?

There is no other visible explanation of the development of morality in the world than that it came about through the association of human beings in groups for mutual aid. Morality came to have a survival value when the ability to live harmoniously with one's fellows became a condition of safe existence. Thus the individual had the protection of his group instead of standing, like Ishmael, alone against the world. Is it not reasonable to suppose that in the struggle, not with other human beings, but with the forces of nature which man undertakes to bend to his will, it will yet be found that cooperation in fellowship and good will is a vastly greater creative force than the brute struggle "Every man for himself, and the devil take the hindmost"? Thus may Christianity come to be understood as the only truly scientific way of life.

For the Discussion Group

Do you agree with the employer who thought that he could make more money if he were not a Christian? What about the lawyer who thought that if business and Chris-

tianity were not compatible, something must be wrong with Christianity?

A young college student said recently: "I'm for Christianity because I believe it will work in the world to-day. If it won't work, I'm off it." Is that a fair statement?

Is the assumption warranted that men work mainly because they have to or for hope of gain? How would the average person like one month of work and eleven months' vacation? Instinctively, are we workers or hoboes?

What incentives are strongest in your own experience? Do the people who seem to be best satisfied with life appear to be seeking material rewards or something different?

Is there such a thing as competition in service? How does it compare ethically with competition for wages or profits? Can you imagine Jesus competing for anything?

Is human nature essentially selfish or is the apparent selfishness only an adjustment to a competitive order? Is the familiar statement "Human nature cannot be changed" true? Do we know what human nature is capable of in the way of social effort until we try?

If it is admitted that "the business of the steel industry is to produce steel," may it still be said that that establishment will produce most steel which most consistently develops personality and builds fellowship? In other words, *can competition compete with cooperation?*

CHAPTER IX

THE RULES OF THE GAME

Micah 6. 6-8; 2 Timothy 2. 1-6

How can industry be made a fellowship of productive service—efficient not only in the production of goods but in the making of men? Can there be orderly government without compulsion and force, without one man being the master of many? Can workers and employers go beyond the "bargaining" stage and make industry a self-governing whole?

The New Game and the Old

We have again and again referred to industry as a game. We have clung to that figure because there seems to be an instinctive element of risk and adventure in life that is fundamental to work as well as to play. It is highly significant that whenever we find ourselves free we start up a game or something or other, and that the work men do most intensely is the thing that has most of the gaming element in it. How large a part this gaming element plays in life is a matter for psychologists to determine. But it requires only a little observation and reflection to discover that it plays an important part. The instinctive fondness for adventure it is hard to get rid of, perhaps impossible. Why should we try? It is not the fact of playing a game that matters, but the kind of game we play and the way we play it.

Now, what is the difference between the old game and the new game that we have proposed? There is much to be said for the present order of things in industry. As Seebohm Rowntree says, speaking of Great Britain, "It gets forty million people up and at work every morning." That's something. And there are many industrial establishments where the crudities of competition are

softened in a remarkable degree by considerateness on the part of management and by sober, wise leadership on the part of the workers. But, according to the view we are presenting here, the old game has two things wrong with it: first, the chances of the game are not equal; secondly, the stakes of the game are not wholesome. And because the stakes are wrong the chances never can be equal. This is the heart of the matter. The old game is comparable to a contest for a set of prizes whose number is limited. Victory for one means loss for others. The rewards are material and the physical and mental ability to contend for them successfully are unevenly distributed through the world. What can be done with that kind of a game? Obviously only what reformers are constantly trying to do—patch up the rules here and there by giving the weaker group a handicap. The old game is one that men play *against* each other. The new game is comparable rather to the game that the pioneer plays with nature or with himself. He is out to conquer the elements, to set new records of achievement, to beat his own previous records. From this point of view competition with others becomes irrelevant. The new game is one that men play *with* each other. Its stakes are personal as well as material, and when they are material they are sought not for private but for social ends.

"Bargaining"

The old game in industry assumes that two groups are contending against each other, and that what is necessary is to even up the chances. A fair field and may the best man win! Thus we have come to think of a fair deal in industry as expressed in terms of collective bargaining. To be sure, it may well be asked, Why bargain if there is a fundamental identity of interest? Paul's great figure of the human body, with all its interdependent parts, is a tremendous one when one stops to take it in. Not merely is the hand unable to say to the eye, "I have no need of thee," but the idea of competition as between the hand and eye is unthinkable. "So we, being many, are one body." It is a revolutionary thought. Ultimately we may rise to

a plane of cooperative living where bargaining will be meaningless.

The kind of bargaining we are here discussing is not the mere exchange of goods or the sale of goods in which both seller and buyer are fully satisfied. The mechanism of exchange by which a fixed price is charged for commodities relieves the bargaining process of much of its crudity. The business game as it is played to-day is a great improvement over the haggling and "beating down" and crafty efforts to gain advantage that would everywhere be apparent in commerce if there were no market regulations and adjustments. Anyone who wants an illustration of the difference needs only to compare the way he feels on entering a standard-meter taxicab with his sensations when he commits himself to the mercies of a driver whose fares are determined by his own snap estimate of what the "traffic will bear." Not only so, but the right, involved in the idea of bargaining, to enter or leave any employment at will has a moral value that must not be overlooked. Yet the fact remains that the bargaining of which we speak in industrial relations is at best a crude method of determining the "price" of labor. It proceeds on the basis, rejected theoretically by labor itself, of the "commodity theory" of labor. Little thought is given to what is the most equitable division of the product; the aim is, rather, to gain the greatest possible advantage. The defects of any such process from the spiritual point of view are apparent.

Yet collective bargaining is an indispensable instrument in bringing about harmony between two contending groups. The value of the bargaining process is not principally in evening up chances nor yet in keeping the peace. If it is a bad peace, it ought not to be kept. Of what use would a successful bargain be to a spiritually minded employer if it were won at the cost of the employees' happiness and good will? The value of bargaining is found, rather, in working out a basis of joint action in the common interest. It is a recognition of social interdependence, and as such is the first step in the creation of fellowship in industry. The new experiments in joint

industrial government are of spiritual consequence because they are resulting in making the rules and determining the stakes of the new game.

The Worker's Struggle for Status

The stakes of the great conflict going on in industry to-day are not merely wages and hours. The primary question is one of status and of power. This is what the demand for recognition on the part of organized labor means. Gains in wages and working conditions are of no permanent value if they cannot be held secure against aggression and against untoward developments in the "labor market." As the employers capitalize their possessions, so the workers are capitalizing their jobs. A labor union is something like a corporation in that by means of it the workers pool the titles to their jobs and act jointly in matters that affect them.

The Drab Routine

But labor's demand for a share in the control of industry would continue quite without reference to the question of the distribution of the product. Recall for a moment the remark which we quoted earlier from a conservative journal that "the new era has put personality in a steel niche, and it must stay put, else large-scale production is impossible." Continuing, the writer said that "some plan must be found whereby men may become interested in their day's work—this is fundamental. It is a twentieth-century problem, and history gives no clue to the solution." If machine production has taken away the instinctive satisfactions in industrial labor, some other satisfaction must be found. Increased financial reward furnishes a considerable incentive, but the practical limits to such an increase are soon reached, and, besides that, there is a limit to the capacity to consume and the power to enjoy consumption. Money satisfies only a fraction of men's elemental demands. Some other satisfaction must be discovered if industry is to be redeemed from the dull drab from which it is suffering.

The Employee's Disadvantage

Much agitation has been felt over the suggestion that the workers should "own the works." An American traveler was standing on the deck of a steamship in English waters looking at the British fleet lying at anchor in the distance. He noted a Scotchman standing near him and made some remark about the fine appearance of the men-of-war. "Yes," said the Scotchman, elevating his chest, "and I am one of the concern that own 'em." It would hardly occur to anyone that the Scot had unwarranted designs on his Majesty's ships! It is perhaps some such feeling as this that labor covets with respect to industry.

The employer gets a large measure of satisfaction out of owning the plant and out of the material rewards which increased energy produces. Towering above the satisfactions of wealth are the satisfactions of power which wealth brings. A man who builds a great industry to leave behind him as a monument to his enterprise feels that in a sense this material structure is a part of his immortality. How much satisfaction of this kind can an employee have, even though he works a lifetime in one establishment, when he knows that at any time the organization can dispense with his services and scarcely miss him? If a man cannot build himself into the concern of which he is a part, if he cannot think and originate and initiate in a way to make himself indispensable to the industry, and if he cannot see some fruit of his own creative effort, he is not likely to thrill over his occupation.

Workers as Owners

We hear much about the cooperative movement as a remedy for inequalities in our economic system, and surely no student of the present-day tendencies can ignore the cooperative movement. It has profound and growing significance, especially in agriculture. Chiefly, however, in this country it is a consumers' or a sellers' movement, and has to do, not with primary industrial processes, but with marketing. Cooperative societies employ labor just

as capitalistic organizations do and are not free from "labor troubles." The cooperative movement is of great social and economic significance, but it has not yet indicated a solution of the labor problem.

There are examples of producers' cooperation where the workers in an industrial establishment themselves own the plant, either from its inception or by purchase from the original owner. Where the capitalist and labor functions are combined, the question of relative status is greatly simplified. The worker is an owner and the owner is a worker. Some of the recent Catholic literature on industrial problems makes much of this plan, restoring as it does on its face much of what the workers lost when the old gild system gave way to the modern factory regime.

It must not be supposed that what we are talking about is the equivalent of profit-sharing through the ownership of stock. The participation in proprietorship here referred to has to do with the workingman as such, not with the workingman as capitalist. There is much to be said for profit-sharing. But when the workers in a concern acquire each a bit of stock and become members of the army of minority holders they have done only what any outsider may do. Their holdings constitute a very small interest and represent no real power. If every industrial concern in the United States were a fifty-fifty profit-sharing enterprise, the labor problem would, in its essence, still remain.

Then what is the answer? We have just noted that some Christian students and writers believe cooperative ownership by the workers is the answer, or at least one answer. But, granting the worth of this plan, it would manifestly take a great while for the workers to absorb the capital involved in modern industry. It would seem that if we can liberate the spirits of men as they go about the day's work, the precise form of the fellowship they would create is a secondary matter. We must remember, however, that there is involved not only a title to a job and perhaps to property, but the exercise of power, dignity, and initiative as well. The real trouble was indicated.

better than she knew, by a little garment worker in New York who was telling to the arbitrator her grievance against the factory boss: "Why," said she, "he looked at me sarcastic."

Industrial Citizenship

In politics men find satisfaction in making their laws and securing the administration of those laws in accord with their will—or at least in making an effort to do so. The requirements of industrial government are comparable to those of political government. In fact, is it not probable that one of the reasons for the scant interest on the part of people in general in political affairs is that the major issues of life which center about our economic needs are so seldom determined by political action? It is much more important to a man to have a voice in determining the issues of his working life than to be able to vote for or against a protective tariff. And the very act of participating in industrial government furnishes a large measure of that interest and initiative of which the worker has been robbed by modern industrialism. As a highly specialized worker he cannot be expected to show enthusiasm over the machine processes which he facilitates. It seems rather—and this brings us to the crux of the matter—that he must find his interest in the intellectual and social aspects of his working life and thus overbalance the monotony of the factory regime. Is it work that men dislike, or meaningless routine work, which makes no provision for intellectual participation and the exercise of personality? "We have removed the human factor," says an advertisement displayed in the New York subway in announcing how safe the road has made its machinery. Just so.

Here again the analogy of politics is instructive. Every schoolboy knows that the Boston Tea Party was not a revolt against taxation, but a revolt against taxation without a voice in the fixing of the tax or in the subsequent expenditure of the money. A large number of industrial disturbances which cripple industry to-day occur over fairly trivial matters and are the expression not so much

of material demands as of dissatisfaction with an inferior status—a position of relative helplessness and unimportance. Wage reductions have frequently been accepted without protest where there was an opportunity for free discussion and for dignified representation. Men have voted themselves reductions in pay and have done it without protest when they would have been sullen and rebellious if the reductions had been forced upon them.

Democracy in Industry

The term "industrial democracy" has been so freely used that it no longer has any definite meaning. Nevertheless, it denotes a tendency which is one of the distinctive signs of our time. It begins with that surrender of autocratic control of industry which the twenty British Quaker employers called upon industrial leaders to make, and the substitution for it of conference, and government by consent. It often takes the form of collective dealing between organizations of employers and labor unions. In fact, it is difficult to see how it can come about unless there is a mutual willingness to negotiate with the existing recognized organizations on each side, save where there is a compelling moral objection to such recognition. The price of recognition on the part of such an organization is honesty of purpose and fidelity to agreements. But bargaining is only a step in the democratic process. If the germ of democracy—might we not also say of Christianity?—is present, the relationship becomes one of mutual respect and mutual concern for rights and duties.

The essence of this new game, as we have been calling it, is a spirit; its visible body is a structure of joint government which makes a constantly widening place for human fellowship. Structure without spirit is no better than formless debris. Many a concern has tried to put over a "plan" which, to adapt a Scripture phrase, "had the form of democracy but denied the power thereof." Such a procedure is likely to end in a labor strike that will be hailed by uncomprehending employers as an evidence of the employees' ingratitude.

On the other hand, a spirit without a structure of government is of little permanent value. With the passing of some engaging and benevolent personality it becomes but a ghost of what might have been. The best ideas and impulses ever let loose, if they are not to be speedily forgotten, need to be blue-printed and built into a firm structure.

Are All Men Equal?

Democracy in industry, like democracy in politics, is not to be confused with any arbitrary notions of equality. Probably few people know what they mean by that term. Most of us, doubtless, would agree that men are not equal intellectually, not equal spiritually, not equal in personal force, not equal in social influence. But just as the most obscure man in a factory when his initiative is released may create something of inestimable worth, so one mind in a fellowship of minds may register in terms of spiritual values beyond all expectation and beyond all estimate. This means that democracy is more an act of faith than a theory of government. It has to be validated in experience, but experience shows that there is no way to limit the possibilities of the obscurest human being. And it is in an atmosphere of freedom, of respect for the individual, of appreciation of the rights and possibilities of others—those who are regarded as enemies as well as those who are regarded as friends—that the structure of an enduring government can be built, whether for industry or politics.

Playing the New Game With the Public

Obviously it would be a simple matter for employers and workers to bury the hatchet if they buried it in the head of the consumer. This is what many people are afraid of. But the new game that we are talking about is a straight game. It leaves no place for exploitation. The fulfillment of industrial citizenship is in service, just as the fulfillment of political citizenship is in patriotism. If there is anything in the fellowship ideal for industry, it is inclusive. It lifts the minds of men above the level of their physical performances and widens their interest be-

yond the shop. Bargaining must give way to service, fear to trust, competition to mutual aid. This is not a dream—it is beginning to come to pass.

For the Discussion Group

Is there any evident desire on the part of either labor or capital for full cooperation? Do the unions want it, or would they prefer to trust to bargaining power to preserve their interests? Do employers want cooperation from their workers, or only tractability?

Is there any danger that harmonious cooperation between employers and workers may lead to the exploitation of the consumer? Does this happen now? Can the "new game" leave the public out?

Is there anything unchristian in the mere act of bargaining between organized interests? Does bargaining necessarily imply that one party gains what another loses?

Some people oppose labor unions because they are belligerent and they keep industry divided into two hostile camps. Is the hostility in industry due mainly to labor? Should a belligerent union be curbed, or should its power and discipline be utilized in the direction of a responsible government in industry?

Is an employer justified in refusing to recognize labor unions because they make for division instead of unity? Can harmony and loyalty be promoted by denying the right of collective bargaining?

Does a voice in management compensate the worker for the monotony of his job? Is the average worker competent to share the duties of management? Is he eager to do so?

Employers are sometimes advised to go through the form of referring important matters to the workers so that "they will think they are doing it." Does that satisfy the requirements of democracy? Does it fool the men?

Should a Christian employer share profits? Should he admit the workers to privileges of ownership? Should they be allowed, as rapidly as they are able, to have a voice in shop control? wages? discipline? finance?

What does democracy mean? Is there any sense in which all men are equal? Someone has given this definition: "Democracy means a chance for every man to be all that it is in him to be and the recognition of every man for all that he is." Is that a good statement? Is it good Christianity?

CHAPTER X

STANDARDS OF LIVING—EVERYBODY'S GAME

Matthew 5. 3-9; James 2. 1-5

Are we as Christian members of the community ready to assume a share of the responsibility for making industry a public service? How much have we to do with making the standards toward which the workers strive, and creating the economic conditions against which they contend? When we complain that the "innocent public" is made to bear the brunt of industrial disturbances, are we as innocent as we fancy? Are we in our individual lives an asset or a liability to the community?

The Consumer's Responsibility

If there is to be fellowship in industry, it cannot be confined to employers, managers, and labor. The consumer of goods, the common citizen, must play his part. And what part is it that the consumer plays? In the long run he makes the standards of production since he makes the standards of life. He pays the bills. He is the potential organizer of the buyer's strike—the most effective strike of all, the one that the employer can never break. The citizen-consumer has it in his power to determine the style of clothes that are worn, the richness of the food that is eaten, the elaborateness of the households of the community, and the degree of luxury that people enjoy. The very existence of multitudes of industries and the value of miles of real estate in the average city are dependent upon the citizen-consumer's idea of what is a desirable thing to eat or to wear, and what is a desirable place to live. Here again in the matter of living standards we find ourselves falling back on the figure of a game—a game which everyone is playing. Most peo-

ple are like the guests at the scriptural marriage feast, waiting for the behest to "come up higher."

Our Standards of Living

Much is said about the sins of the rich in setting artificial standards which are then adopted by all classes in society whether there is any possibility of their realization or not; but the underlying fact is that the whole world pays tribute socially to the "lord of things as they are." Thus, paradoxically, the things that divide us are, after all, the things that all classes have in common—the love of beauty and comfort, the satisfactions of the senses, the tendency to hero worship and the love of praise. Most people, no matter how poor—and perhaps more eagerly the poorer they are—read with rapt attention the accounts of royal weddings and thrill over the portrayal of luxury. They covet attention from "social superiors" and are cowed by the frowns of those who sit in the seats of the socially mighty. Psychologists have regarded this an instinctive performance, and it used to be described as the instinct of "mastery and submission." The interesting thing about it is that one changes with the greatest ease from one rôle to the other. The man in the parable who cringed before his creditor and then went out and took his debtor by the neck was a type of humankind. We are creatures of a social environment which has arranged us all in a sliding scale. Everyone's standard of living is a creation of economic circumstances which the whole community has a share in creating.

Is the Individual Responsible?

But even recognizing this interdependence of social groups it is hardly fair for the individual to claim an alibi. This is a delightfully convenient thing to do. A young woman whose father pointed out to her that her sister's spending allowance was less than her own said with comfortable unconcern: "That's all right. It costs more to keep me than it does to keep Rose." This was equivalent to saying that one takes his standard of living as he does the color of his hair, as something belonging to native

equipment for which he has no personal responsibility. As is usually true of questionable doctrines there is much to be said for this argument. It is quite absurd to say that all people, regardless of their cultural level, can live on the same amount of money. Would not a piano, which is a cultural necessity in some homes, be an absurd extravagance in others? And what shall be said of a library or of a collection of classic paintings? Undoubtedly culture alters the whole texture of one's life and makes one dependent upon certain environmental conditions to which others are not sensitive at all. But is it necessary that a home should be elaborate in order to be artistic? that a diet should be costly in order to be appetizing as well as wholesome?

Merely to say this suggests an important caution. Do not most of us view critically the standards of those who live on a higher scale economically than ourselves and find some measure of satisfaction in the greater frugality and simplicity of our own lives, and then excuse ourselves from practicing the economies of those who have smaller incomes on the ground that their standards of living are lower than our own?

The Level of "Social Efficiency"

This is a realm in which it is not possible to dogmatize; and perhaps the most useful thing to do is to ask searching questions. If Christian people asked more questions concerning the requirements of the Christian way of life and discussed them with their friends, should we not make vastly greater progress in that direction? There is something splendid in the spectacle of those twenty British Quaker employers taking solemn counsel together and then calling upon their fellow employers of other faiths or of no faith "to consider very carefully whether their style of living and personal expenditure are restricted to what is needed to insure the efficient performance of their functions in society." Even this standard of social efficiency may conceivably justify extraordinary expenditures at times, but is it not clear that a Christian will not take such things as a matter of course?

The question is sure to arise whether this business of simplification may not be carried so far that the possibilities of culture would be reduced. Suppose the patronage of art should disappear and the pursuit of higher intellectual and æsthetic interests should be unprovided for. The whole world is enriched by the intellectual and artistic efforts of a few. We cannot, even in the interest of the simple life, sacrifice the results of research and of creative artistic activity. But when we reason this way do we not forget that there are social and antisocial ways of supporting art and culture? A rich man may buy a porcelain collection and give it to a public museum, or he may lock it up at home for his own private satisfaction and the delectation of his friends. He may buy a great organ and place it in a public auditorium or he may confine its strains within the limits of his own domicile. He may encourage a talented artist by buying a picture that everybody may see or he may engage an artist to paint his own picture, which nobody is particularly anxious to see.

But this may all be very simple and easy for us because we are not rich. It is one of the besetting sins of the middle class that they obscure their own sins in the shadows of those that seem larger. What about our own extravagances?

How Living Standards Affect Fellowship

The whole scale of living standards that we have been talking about cuts across the spiritual ideal of fellowship. It separates where fellowship unites. It creates rivalries and animosities where fellowship creates good will. The man who maintains two automobiles for uses that could be as well performed by one, the woman who maintains a wardrobe beyond the requirements of utility and simple beauty—might it not be said that they are trafficking in the things that separate human beings in spirit rather than in the things that unite them. The minister whose living standard is away beyond that of the majority of his parishioners—is he not building up a barrier that all his spiritual ministrations will find it impossible to over-

throw? The material consequences of this great variety of living standards are as great as the spiritual. The consumption of luxury goods keeps men and women engaged in producing them. Money that is invested in producing luxury goods might be invested in producing goods for use. Luxury goods for the most part are consumed only by the wealthy. "Use" goods are consumed by everybody. If we look at it this way, the money and the time and the effort that we expend in ways that mean nothing to humanity as a whole are unjustified.

We often hear it said that poor people are to blame for their condition because of wasteful expenditures and the habit of living beyond their means. But might it not be argued that the extravagances of the poor are cheap imitations of the extravagances of the well-to-do? It is not the libraries and art collections and opera tickets and vacations in the mountains—the more æsthetic of the indulgences of the well-to-do—that the poor imitate, but their superficial display and noisy elegance. Might not people satisfy their taste for beauty and refinement without violating fellowship? The things that are most appealing and permanently satisfying are the things that are most human—the things we can share.

How Living Standards Affect Industry

But are we still discussing industry, or have we run off into "stewardship" or something else? The fact is that nothing could be more germane to the subject of this course than the matter of personal expenditures. In the first place, it is because we have such a wide range of living standards and insist on defending them that the question of a living wage for the workers has thrown us into so much difficulty. Any attempt to budget the expenditures of a workingman's family must result in assigning them a level of living that benevolently minded persons would be ashamed of or in putting the minimum at such a liberal level that the national income would never stand it. The easy course, therefore, has been to take refuge behind the economic difficulties of the situation and quit talking about a living wage. After several years of study,

resulting in the promulgation of minimum standards by employers' groups, labor agencies, and independent investigators, there has been a tendency to abandon the whole "budget theory" of wage fixing.

But in spite of this confusion the fixing of a minimum wage by law is favored by many people, especially for women workers. It is done in a number of States, although the Supreme Court decision in the District of Columbia case—that the fixing of a minimum wage is contrary to the freedom of contract guaranteed by the Constitution—has made the future of this sort of legislation very doubtful. In any case, the fixing of a minimum wage by law is but a small part of the problem. The solution must be found within industry, not outside it. Wage increases that are forced invite the pyramiding of prices. Where there is no cooperative good will, no restraint self-imposed by the will to fellowship, no device will serve the purpose.

Secondly, artificially high living standards (or perhaps we might say *low,* from an ethical point of view) require that many workers shall be permanently employed in producing luxuries and rendering needless services. This taxes our whole economic order and is partly responsible for the national deficit in production. Could not the economic ills of the world be largely met by deflecting capital from the production of luxuries to the production of necessities? That is, cost might be lowered to the point where the poorest might obtain food, clothing, and shelter in proportion to normal human needs. Labor employed in producing goods that only a few can enjoy lessens the production of goods that the many need.

The Limiting of Production

Furthermore, and most of all to the point, the difference in living standards which so conspicuously violates fellowship is apparently the psychological reason for low production. The workers are naturally slow about increasing their product when the net social result seems to be merely a widening of the gulf that separates the economically dependent from the well-to-do. It is rather startling that in the last thirty years, in spite of a con-

siderable increase in the production from land and industry in America, the real wage—that is, purchasing power—of labor appears not to have increased. American labor is not radical—not yet. It is not demanding exclusive control of anything. Making due allowance for the more favored occupations, the heart has been taken out of labor by the seeming impossibility of improving its status in any marked degree. Employers are saying that labor is not playing the game. Quite so. Labor is coming to feel that the game—the old game—is not worth the candle. If society cannot devise a means whereby through diligence a worker may gradually improve the standard of his family's living until it includes more and more of the things that go to make up a "good life," what can we expect but that he will put less and less energy into his work?

All this is unintelligible to a person whose attention is fixed on the high wages of certain privileged groups. That such groups profiteer when they have a chance simply serves to call attention to the crudeness of the old competitive game. The deficiencies of the workers and the noncooperative policies of many labor bodies are well known. Labor has lost many opportunities for signal service. But the fact that is written largest in the industrial situation, morally considered, is the inequality of privilege, emolument, and power. This inequality is permanently registered in the contrast between living standards.

A "Deficit Industry"

The textile industry gives an apt illustration of the difficulty. A high-minded employer in that industry has been trying for some years to put his establishments on a Christian basis. He has accomplished much, but he finds that the level of wages in the industry is so low and the margin of profit so small that even sharing profits "fifty-fifty" does not bring the workers within sight of what might be called a minimum comfort standard. Under such circumstances high production is not likely to be secured. Obviously there is an unlimited market for

textile goods provided the workers of America had the purchasing power to consume them. More production would cheapen the cost and put this higher grade of goods within the reach of the workers themselves. But until there is some assurance that the result of greater effort will be greater justice and more service, rather than greater privilege for the few, the workers will continue to do only a fraction of what they are capable of.

In this connection there comes to mind a clothing factory where a sudden increase in wages and an announcement of a square deal brought about an astonishing increase in production. The workers, generally speaking, can do much more than they are doing, but it is not just a matter of saying to them, "Go to, now, produce." They want to know what their labor is going to mean. So should we.

Our Own Part in the Game

The fact seems clear that the question of comparative living standards must be faced resolutely before anything definite can be said about "fair" wages and a "fair return." It is to be feared that these terms have served chiefly as a smoke screen. The United States Railroad Labor Board has demonstrated how much difficulty even a government agency can get into by trying to maintain the concept "just and reasonable" without any comparative treatment of living standards and living costs. Unless we face this question we must be content to play the old game, whose stakes are material stakes, and whose spiritual effect is a widening gulf between man and man.

For the Discussion Group

Most of us make some attempt at budgeting our expenditures; what criterion have we followed? Can this group agree on a reasonable budget of expense for a family of average size?

Working people are commonly criticized for buying luxuries they cannot afford, and middle-class people are often criticized for "living beyond their income." Is it to

be taken for granted, then, that the chief requirement is to live within one's income?

Where do we get our living standards? Can we change them at will? Would it be an easier matter to simplify our living if groups of people tried it together?

Were the British Quaker employers right in their statement concerning extravagance and "social efficiency"? What is an extravagance—an automobile? two automobiles? a trip to Europe? What is the determining principle?

Some Christians have laid down the rule that they should "not eat cake while any of their fellows were deprived of bread." Is that a safe rule to follow? Would such abstinence have any effect on the actual supply of bread? Would it have any moral effect?

Is the living-wage idea valid? How can it be defined?

"A man is entitled to what he earns." Yes, but how can we determine what he earns? Some Christians consider that if a man works hard at useful labor, he "earns" a good living. What do you say?

If some of us insist on having more than others can hope to have, are we violating the principle of fellowship?

CHAPTER XI

CHRISTIANS AS INVESTORS—THE RISKS OF THE GAME

Matthew 6. 19-23

Once again, have we not overlooked an important part that many of us play as individuals in the industrial game? Does the ownership of stocks and bonds impose a definite obligation? Whose is the primary responsibility —the person who owns the security or the corporation director who determines policy in accord with what he thinks the owner desires? Is there any difference between the Christian investor and any other investor when proxies are turned in or coupons are clipped? What can a conscientious stockholder do to secure recognition of his ideals?

Who Are the Capitalists?

It is when we come to the question of investment that we appreciate the full force of the figure of the game which we have been carrying through this whole series. We are all potential investors. It has been said with a good deal of truth that we are all potential gamblers. Now, there is no question at all as to the necessary part that capital plays in the world. Even those who are very hostile to what is known as the capitalist system—that is to say, to the system of production for private profit—recognize that capital as such is a necessity of the industrial world. Capital means equipment, machinery—everything in the nature of resources, except human resources, that makes it possible to carry on industrial enterprise. Capital is the social surplus, the savings of society which are used for the future production of goods. It is also the means by which the "time gap" is bridged between the beginning of an industrial process and the actual marketing of the

product. There are many opinions as to how capital used in the production of goods should be owned and controlled, but these questions really belong in a course in economics. In our system capital is privately owned, and therefore all industry depends ultimately upon the investor.

It is a common error, often pointed out by bankers, that "capital" denotes chiefly rich and powerful investors. The bulk of the money to run business enterprises comes not from the wealthy (because there is not enough wealth concentrated in a few hands to supply it) but from the great mass of men and women of moderate means. When this fact is recognized it throws new light on the responsibilities of capital. In the long run monetary power resides where political power resides—in the people themselves, excepting, of course, that section of the working class, far too large, which is not able to save and invest. But the difficulty lies, as it does in politics, in securing organized action on the part of the multitude of individuals who count for little as they stand apart, but who could decisively influence the policies of great corporations if they stood together. And just as in politics the multitude lacks the knowledge, the initiative, and the sense of responsibility to play an intelligent part, so in business the majority of investors are too ignorant of the facts and too timid or too little interested to exercise any important influence.

The Theory of Interest

In the old game that we have been considering, the investor is perhaps the hardest player. He usually invests his first earnings with a view to safety and a small but consistent reward. As his holdings increase, he begins to seek more lucrative investments and he is willing to take a greater risk because he has more resources to fall back upon; and in return for the greater risks he expects a larger reward. With the increase in risks there comes into existence what is known as speculative investment, where the person's desire is not merely to obtain a dividend but to double or treble or to multiply manifold the

value of the investment itself. That is to say, beginning with the buying of securities for the purpose of gaining a "fair return" in stated income, the business investment often becomes ultimately a gamble on an increase in the market values of securities or other property. We have already seen how the idea of interest itself was originally repugnant to the Christian mind and was, in fact, illegal in England until late in the sixteenth century. Since that time, however, comparatively few people have ever raised a question as to the ethical quality of interest. It is assumed that just as a person earns a money reward by working, so he earns a similar reward by abstaining from the use of his money in order that it may be productively employed. "Let your money work for you," is an old investor's motto. A new concept expressed by the words "fair return" has been evolved to cover the moral obligations of investors.

The Profit Motive

But what about the speculative motive, or, in other words, the profit motive? Is it ever legitimate from a Christian point of view to choose deliberately an investment regardless of its other qualities solely because it is likely to yield a return for which no effort has been made and no equivalent sacrifice suffered? Is it consistent with a Christian order that our motive should be to secure something for nothing? To illustrate, assuming that eight per cent or ten per cent is commonly accepted as a fair return on capital, is it legitimate to seek a hundred per cent, the first eight or ten of which would represent, on this basis, a "fair" return and the additional ninety-two per cent would be a sheer gratuity—something for nothing? To be sure, it may be asked what would become of the surplus earnings of a very profitable enterprise if they were not absorbed in dividends. If a great surplus accrues, it must accrue to somebody. One answer would be that all the surplus should become new capital, that is, should be "put back into the business." But our inquiry has to do not so much with the actual distribution of wealth or capital as with the motives involved.

A "Good Investment"—Morally

This whole matter bites into the social conscience at the point where we discover the difference in the moral quality of investments. If all securities were of equal social significance and value, it might well be argued that that which offers the greatest return is the one to choose without reference to any other consideration. If the only important thing about money is what one does with it, the more one can make the better, so long as he keeps within the law. Indeed, there was a time when, while great emphasis was placed upon spending money, little was said concerning the ethical quality of the methods by which money was made. Now, however, "stewardship" is coming to be interpreted to cover the acquisition of wealth as well as its expenditure. A popular evangelist is reputed to have said, when criticized because of his large fees, that he gave a tithe of his income to the Lord, and it was no one's business what he did with the rest. The utter inadequacy of such a defense from the modern Christian point of view does not need to be pointed out. But we have much careful thinking to do before any consensus among Christian people can be arrived at as to what constitutes a valid motive in investment. Should we not be guided by a study of the actual social consequences of the investments themselves? What are some of these consequences and what are some of the evident differences between various types of investment?

The Practical Test

First, there is the distinction corresponding to the one made earlier between occupations that are socially productive and those that are not. Might we not say that no person is justified in putting his money into an enterprise which he would be unwilling on ethical grounds to engage in personally? He might, of course, be unwilling to enter it on other grounds, such as temperament or aptitude. But if he could not conscientiously perform a given act, how can he let his money hire someone else to do it? Then there is the question of the relative use-

fulness of an industry or a business that is beyond criticism as to its moral character, as ordinarily considered. What will a Christian do when he has an opportunity to invest his money at eight per cent in a boot and shoe factory or at three per cent in annuity bonds of an educational enterprise? Is there any moral quality in such a choice? This brings us to the main issue of the matter —the risks of the game. In the old game, risk was merely an incident to the play for profits. In the new game, the cooperative game, whose aim is the establishment of fellowship in the world, the risks are of a moral nature. They are undertaken in order that not only material but spiritual goods may be released upon the markets of the world.

"Speculative Investments" and Human Values

A year or two ago a business man in New York proposed to a group of churchmen that a company should be organized which would invest half its resources in marketable securities paying current rates of interest, and the other half in an effort to rehabilitate the industrial establishment of Europe. "Thus," he said, "we can say to people that they may be fairly assured of an average return, and a much larger return if the European venture succeeds, but that the latter portion of the investment is financially uncertain and may be lost. But that part of the money will be a spiritual investment and we will ask them to be willing to lose it in order to take the chance of being of service to the rest of the world." Perhaps this distinction between types of investment throws some light upon the Christian principle.

Some persons have expressed great interest in what might be called exploratory investments—that is to say, enterprises which involve experimentation in the fields of industrial organization. No matter how convinced individuals may be on the point, society demands a demonstration that the principle of brotherhood can be established in industry, that industrial democracy is a valid concept. How are we going to prove it? We have considered the requirements of our Christian faith which call upon us

to make the experiment. But such experiments require money as well as faith. They require capital, equipment, brains. People must be found who are willing to invest their money at a small rate of interest and at more than ordinary risk in order to test out the theories of Christian idealism with respect to industrial organization. There is more than a fifty-fifty chance that many such experiments will fail before the proper adjustment of means to ends has been discovered. But can a faith that is not worth "putting something up on" be called Christian? Donald Hankey said that religion is "betting your life that there is a God." He had every right to say that: later he wagered his life "on Flanders Fields" and lost—and won! Is it not possible that the establishment of the Christian ideal in the world requires just such adventure?

What Can One Lone Person Do?

One of the writers, who had been investigating working conditions in industry, was asked by a friend to inform him concerning the labor policy of a certain concern which had advertised a bond issue. He wanted to buy a bond, provided he approved the labor policy of the concern in question. A ring on the telephone brought the perplexed retort, "What has the labor policy to do with buying a bond?" "You see," it was explained, "this gentleman does not want to put his money into a concern whose labor policy he does not approve." This elicited many expressions of disgust and the interesting admission that the office of the concern had experienced much annoyance during the day by requests for information about the labor policy. What would happen if the Christian people of America for one week would take seriously their obligation as investors for industrial conditions in establishments which their money maintains? What would happen if they merely insisted on knowing the facts? What would have happened ten years ago to the twelve-hour day in the steel industry when a stockholders' committee urged that the regime be done away with, if the Christian people who held stock in the corporation,

or any considerable minority of them, had demanded that the long day be abolished? And that means, of course, if they had been willing, if necessary, to decline attractive dividends rather than to share responsibility for an industrial regime that a Christian conscience could not approve.

The Treatment of Proxies

But what good do isolated protests of this sort do? As in politics, it is perfectly obvious that people could do great exploits collectively, while separate and alone they are negligible. A young woman who is a small holder of railroad securities when asked, as usual, for her proxy came back with some pointed question as to labor policy, but was met only with courteous evasions. Can a person single-handed accomplish anything? Surely we should all grant that even if a person acting alone cannot register in any evident way, he can at least square himself with his conscience by acting alone! But there are definite ways of making protests, and it sometimes requires but a few protests to turn the scale in a matter of policy. If a few weeks of publicity and activity on the part of outsiders induced the heads of the steel industry to revise their judgment in the matter of the twelve-hour day, is it not reasonable to suppose that more persistent protests on the part of stockholders might have had a pronounced effect? A single stockholder may accompany his proxy for stockholders' meeting with a definite proviso or protest concerning any matter of policy which he believes to involve an important moral principle. He may attend the meeting in person and require a public statement there concerning such important questions. He may claim the right to inspect the list of stockholders and then make it his business to approach his fellow security holders in relation to these moral issues.

What Can One Do With a Doubtful Security?

In a small meeting of Christian people of inquiring mind where this question of morally safe investments was raised, a bond expert suggested that if anyone has con-

scientious scruples against a particular investment, he has an obvious way out by simply disposing of the securities. But is not that too obvious? What is the net result of such action? The securities have passed out of the hands of a conscientious holder into the hands of one less conscientious. The perplexed investor has simply found an obliging individual who will do his sinning for him. An unhappy solution, surely. In an extremity, a holder might call upon the corporation to take his securities off his hands and return the amount of his original investment. Probably most concerns would rise very promptly to such an occasion. But should not that be the last resort, after every possibility of bringing about a change of policy has been exhausted? Merely to unload the troublesome security upon someone else too strongly reminds one of the minister who said midway in his discourse, "And now, having looked the difficulty squarely in the face, let us pass on!"

Financially Safe or Morally Safe?

Business experts are likely to take the view that an investment that is morally unsound is to be avoided for business reasons also. But does not this oversimplify the problem? What the business expert usually means by a morally unsafe investment is one that the business community itself considers questionable. It would be the greatest mistake, and injustice as well, to overlook the importance that the business community attaches to integrity, honesty, and loyalty. But here is where our problem arises. Because business men are preoccupied with the rules of the game, many of the questions which socially minded Christians are asking about investments have as yet no meaning for them. A New York banker, a man of high personal character and gentle, attractive personality, was asked by one of the writers about the relation of labor policy to the validity of industrial securities. He replied that, of course, if an employer should shoot his men at sunrise some such question might be raised, but otherwise he could see no reason for contesting the validity of securities on moral grounds. Another

banker remarked that the one great sin "below Fulton Street" is to have a bad credit; that other questions are of minor importance. We even hear of men of far from impeccable moral character in their private life who survive in the financial community. The most questionable things are done by corporations in breaking faith with the public or with creditors and "got away with" so long as the concerns remain solvent. But these latter cases will be said to be exceptional; and doubtless they are. Nevertheless, the fact remains that it is precisely those matters in which the financial community is not interested that the conscience of the modern Christian is exploring. How does a concern treat its employees? What wages does it pay? Has labor a personal status or only a "commodity" status in the industry? What is the policy of the concern toward the public? Is any moral principle recognized as to the relation between profits, prices, and costs? What is done with the surplus—is it poured out in dividends, or does the community share it in larger enterprise, increased production, more stable prices, and more employment? It may well be said that in the long-run the best moral policy is the best financial policy. But in the short run, with a view to immediate returns, who can say so? Oil and steel continue to sell on the securities market no matter whether the workers put in long hours or not—and no matter how many lives may be sacrificed to the building up of a mammoth industry.

For the Discussion Group

Do you know any investment concerns that are accustomed to include in their advices to investors the considerations referred to in this chapter? If not, what is the reason?

Is there any difference morally between one's claim to money that he earns by labor or other service and his claim to money that his investments earn? If so, how would you state it?

Is there any difference morally between money that is earned at the "market rate" of interest on capital and money that accrues from a lucky sale or purchase, or a

sudden discovery of wealth—"unearned increment," as it is sometimes called?

Granted that all such gains belong rightfully to the person who acquires them, is there any special obligation attaching to the use to which they are put?

If a Christian has an opportunity to invest his money at the same expected rate of return in an enterprise that is relatively sure but is a purely "business proposition" and also in an enterprise involving greater business risk but promising more in terms of social value and progress, what choice will he make? Can a general rule be laid down covering such a situation?

Is one's conduct as an individual investor a fair standard by which to judge his social ethics? Does it reflect his personal character?

Would a person be justified in selling a stock or bond that troubled him to a person who had no scruples about it? If not, would he be justified in *giving* it to him? Why?

Is there any sense in which "financially safe" and "morally safe" mean the same thing? Could a morally bad investment be doomed by the collective disapproval of Christian investors?

CHAPTER XII

THE CHURCH AND INDUSTRY—THE SPIRIT OF THE GAME

Romans 12. 9-21

WHAT part should the church play in the redemption of industry? What part is it actually playing? Is the subject too technical for the pulpit to deal with? Should the church take up controversial matters at the risk of dividing its constituency? Does the church command the respect of labor to-day? Does it command the respect of capital, or only its indulgent good will?

THE PULPIT'S DILEMMA

It is one thing to say that Christianity has a message for industry and quite another to attempt to relate the church as an institution to industrial problems. If the church undertakes to become in any way responsible for the industrial policies maintained by its members and within the community which it serves, all sorts of embarrassing questions may arise. The minister may attempt to admonish where he is not very well informed; he may arouse antagonisms that will interfere with the internal life and harmony of the church itself; unfair discrimination may result; unfair judgments may be pronounced; the minister may get beyond his depth in economics; and so on through a long list of objections which are often heard. All these things may happen, do happen. But entirely different inferences are drawn from them by different groups of people. Many, probably the majority, of ministers and laymen are inclined to drop a question when it gets hot—not necessarily because they lack courage, but because they don't know what to do.

MINISTERS VERSUS LAYMEN

At present it appears that the ministers are a bit readier

to take advance ground than the laymen. In a convention of the Massachusetts Diocese of the Protestant Episcopal Church early in 1923 it was proposed to initiate under church auspices an investigation of the textile industry in order to learn why so many crises occur in it that have serious human consequences. The proposal was voted down, the ministers being conspicuous among the minority and the laymen among the majority. But it must be recognized that there is no rush on the part of either the clergy or the laity to get the church into active participation in industrial affairs. The prevailing view seems to be that the church must teach, and the pulpit must preach Christian principles as applicable to industry, but that the application must be left to the individual Christian. There is, however, an insistent minority that urges a more aggressive policy. They think that unless principles are concretely applied they are not really taught. They hold that if the preacher is weak on economics, he ought to study it. They argue that the church which participated in the prohibition movement cannot consistently keep out of the movement for industrial betterment. They prefer what they consider a more active and effectual ministry on the part of the church even though some animosities may result and some people may leave the church in consequence.

There is room for suspicion that many preachers would find the method of confining themselves to general principles an easy way out. People seldom fight over "general principles." The minister who pronounced from his pulpit the unexceptionable moral admonition "Thou shalt not lie" secured no visible response, but when he particularized: "Thou shalt not lie in making out thy income-tax return," one of his elders left the church. The experience of educators indicates that we learn by contact with the particular, not by discussing generalities.

Freedom of the Pulpit

There are a number of examples of ministers who have used their pulpits to expound the social gospel fearlessly and have maintained their positions. There are also not

a few ministers who have lost their pulpits because of their liberal social views. It is often said that if a minister uses wisdom and maintains a Christian spirit, he can preach with the greatest freedom. Certainly it is important for the minister to remember that he is supposed to be a teacher of ethics, and that proclaiming is not necessarily teaching; also, that no good teacher tries to tell his whole story at once. There are preachers who have set about their social ministry as if they desired nothing so much as martyrdom, and one who is headed that way never has to wait very long. The progress of the Kingdom requires not merely men who are willing to lose their pulpits, but men who can retain them without compromise. Yet one would be rather credulous to suppose that mere tact and a benign countenance will get a socially minded preacher over the rough places. And why should the preacher be everywhere well spoken of? His Master most decidedly was not. And he gave his disciples a special warning against being spoken well of by everybody. John Wesley was troubled in spirit when he ceased to draw the hostile fire of the mob. He feared that if the "scandal of the cross" had ceased, there must be something wrong with his ministry. No doubt the founder of Methodism was a bit austere and not to be taken as an example in all things, but might not the modern preacher do well to take a leaf or two out of his book? There is a sense in which one is best known by the enemies he makes. Where would such a judgment leave most modern apostles of Christianity? If there is anything more questionable than to antagonize recklessly, it is to antagonize nothing or nobody.

The Courage of a Layman

There is surely something wrong with a church which lets its preacher stand on the firing line alone. Perhaps not many do just that, but is not the conception of the church as a militant organization getting a little rusty? It is a delightful thing for brethren to dwell together in peace and unity—if it is an honorable peace and a real unity. But the temptation to regard every departure

from complacent harmony as an evil is very strong among both ministers and laymen. It is amazing how many legitimate complaints a congregation can find a way to bring against a preacher who talks too boldly about the social transgressions of church members or the social sins of society. His mannerisms become more conspicuous, his conversation is less attractive, his family is less popular, when seen against the background of distasteful social and economic doctrine. Yet there are outstanding examples of fighting laymen—that is, of men and women who deliberately share the prophetic office of the minister and in a pinch make his fight their own. It is doubtful if any minister can long succeed unless he rears up a group of such spirits to his support. They serve more than one purpose. They hold up the minister's hands; they support his faith and courage when he weakens; they supply the lay wisdom that a clergyman is likely to lack. More than this, a group of laymen may even bring a timid or recalcitrant minister forward to the front-line defenses. There are probably many laymen who secretly entertain a sort of contempt for a minister who is not a bold ethical leader even though they conceal this feeling by an external courtesy and deference.

Facing Intimidation

It is a question whether many laymen who have ceased to take their minister seriously would not be better pleased with him if he preached a more virile gospel, even though they winced under his message. A certain minister in New England was warned by his leading layman on a Saturday night that he should recede from his announced intention of speaking on a local industrial dispute the following day. He quietly told that gentleman that he never allowed anyone to take such a liberty with him and terminated the interview. The address was given as planned and the layman had a change of heart. It must have been something of this element of fearless finality in the ministry of Jesus that led men to say of him, "He taught as one having authority." Would it not be a wholesome thing if Christian laymen should assume a larger

measure of responsibility for the ethical platform of the church? If there is any courage needed, why leave it all to the man who has to risk his position and the living of his children in order to exercise it? College trustees —or some of them—are coming to feel a definite responsibility, regardless of their own views, to preserve "academic freedom." A man well known in American financial circles said recently of a college of which he was trustee: "I don't approve of all the economics taught there, but I'm willing to have it taught. In a liberal institution the professors ought to be free." Should not the preacher be as free as the college professor?

The Church as Employer

At the convention of a great religious organization a year or so ago a telegram was received from the officers of a bookbinders' union urging the churchmen to see to it that men and women who were working on Bibles and hymn books be paid a living wage! No matter what merit there may have been in their contention or their way of bringing it forward, the message of the union officials was rather startling. It called attention to the fact that a church body can have as serious a conflict with its employees as often occurs in the case of a secular concern. And the points in dispute are the same—wages and working conditions and recognition of the trade unions. It seems a little strange when a church body in its capacity as employer refuses to confer or to arbitrate or even to accept friendly offices of conciliation. Several of our church bodies have large publishing concerns. It should be said for them in this respect that probably in no industry have more provocative things occurred against the employers' interest in recent years than in the printing trades. But the complexity of the problem only accentuates its importance.

The duty of the church as an employer is not always clear. Is it sufficient that employees of the church be paid the going rate of wages, or should the church be consciously exemplary in these matters, going beyond what is required? Should the church as an employer seek to

exemplify the employer-employee relationship that we try to bring about in industry? Is it not worth considering that the church's business ventures should be deliberately put on a basis of moderate profit and under the most skillful human management, in order to make a demonstration of Christian principles, even though it might mean a temporary loss in revenue?

The Church as Industrial Arbitrator

There is no question as to whether the minister can successfully act as arbitrator, for he has often done so. The dean of the Cathedral of Saint John the Divine in New York a few years ago gave an award in a quarry workers' dispute that would have done credit to a skilled arbitrator. And the award was cheerfully accepted by both sides. There are doubtless many examples of such action that never become widely known. What could reflect more honor upon the church than that its pulpit should be associated with the pronouncement of fair judgments in that area of human relationships which is most prolific of disturbances? But the minister when appealed to as an arbitrator acts as a citizen precisely as any other person would act under the same circumstances. It is a different situation when in the name of the church he intervenes in a controversy against the opposition of one or both of the disputants. Is it a prerogative of organized religion to assert itself in such a situation?

If the difficulty were one of law enforcement, the suppression of commercialized vice or the liquor or drug traffic, the church would not hesitate. Why should it hesitate in an industrial dispute which may have most serious, perhaps tragic, consequences for the whole community? There is one obvious difference in the fact that in a reform crusade the church attacks outsiders only, while in an industrial dispute the disputants are probably both represented inside the church. "A house divided against itself cannot stand." Hence, it is freely argued, the church should keep out. But that depends on how one looks at it. If regeneration, like charity, begins at home, should not the church act all the more quickly in a

matter which threatens to disrupt its own fellowship? Would it, perhaps, strengthen the grip of the church on its membership and on its community if it were to discipline its members more resolutely? It is at least arguable that the church was a more admirable as well as more potent institution when its prelates did not hesitate to discipline severely for moral offenses and even to deny fellowship to the persistent offender.

The Church's Contribution to Industry

This suggestion of the authority of the church brings us again to the essential principle of Christianity which the church exists to exemplify—the principle of fellowship. It is central in Christian teaching that men are brothers, and unless the suggestions put forward in this course are wrong, the key to Christianity's power is in the fact of fellowship. It would seem, then, that the church—not merely the local congregation, but the whole church—has a definite ministry to a divided industrial world, namely, to unite the fragments of that world within its own fellowship. Is it not strange that employers who continually call for the recognition of partnership in industry do not realize that the one institution whose avowed purpose is to create the spiritual harmony on which "partnership" depends is an indispensable ally? Though the spokesman of organized religion can serve the industrial expert but little in his own technical field, the church has its own field of expertness; it is the field of human relations. In this field should not the supremacy of the church be unchallenged? Is there not a danger that when called on to perform this high and spiritual office the church may find the altar fires of its own fellowship burning too low to melt the animosities that divide mankind?

The church's office in promoting fellowship not only gives it authority; it is the substance of the church's opportunity. By definition, the church is a community—the "communion of the saints." Many of these "saints" have, it is true, few of the visible accomplishments of sainthood, yet they "belong" to the church, and the church is their schoolmistress. A noted Christian teacher once said, "The

only way to know God as a Father is to act like a son." And no one can act like a son who cannot act like a brother. The chief business of the church, as Dr. Charles E. Jefferson has said, is to "build a brotherhood." If the church can embrace, with a tie that binds, the men of industry who have been fighting one another, it will demonstrate its spiritual supremacy in the world.

The Difference Between a Church and a Club

But this is not an ice-cream-social performance. A prominent churchman recently proclaimed his resentment of the charge that the church is not a friend to the workingman. He cited the welcome given to the plainly dressed stranger, and things of that sort. All this may be wholly true yet wholly irrelevant. The fellowship we are talking about is easily faked—for a while. People very easily fool themselves about it. The biggest aristocrats imagine themselves democratic. The real question is not one of tolerance or even courtesy; it is one of respect, honor, companionship, friendship. The fellowship of the church capitalizes the things men hold in common, not those that separate them. It is something quite other than what the social club or the trade association or the trade union offers. In it a man finds his brother because he needs him—needs him not as a social or a business asset, but as a fellow. This fellowship cannot be bought; men have renounced fortunes for it. When it is exchanged for material prosperity, the things men set their hopes upon turn ashes. When the church ceases to be the home of that kind of fellowship, it ceases to serve the purpose for which that institution exists.

Preparing Young People for Life

Such a spiritual fellowship cannot be created overnight; It is the product of education. Here is a task for the church school. To-day, to be sure, it teaches boys and girls that love and service are the great things in life, but somewhere between the Sunday-school stage and the adult stage of church membership much of this idealism disappears. The young idealists go to work for the mature

realists, and in the process of coming to maturity and a knowledge of the world young people learn to distinguish between what is "practical" and what is "mere idealism," just counsels of perfection, not to be taken too seriously. What is the reason? Is it, perhaps, to be found in our failure to teach Christian ethics concretely? We did not learn to walk while sitting in our high chairs. How can one learn what Christianity means for industry and business except by studying these subjects in the concrete? An American member of the High Commission of the Rhineland, when relating to a group of ministers on his return to this country the tangle of European industry and trade, declared, "You ministers must study economics." If the minister must get practical economics along with his ethics, what about the layman?

In other words, the old game will "get" us all unless we are prepared and eager to play the new game. The stakes of the new game appeal only to those who have learned to love and honor their fellows and who can find satisfaction not in destructive competition, but only in mutual aid. It is the business of the church to prepare people to play for spiritual stakes.

For the Discussion Group

Which is the greater danger—that the pulpit will misplace its influence in industrial affairs through lack of knowledge, or that it will have no influence at all?

Would the average minister take a more active part in industrial affairs if he were assured of the sympathetic support of his laymen? Does the average layman want his minister to discuss these questions?

Which is the proper course for a minister to follow—

(*a*) Take sides definitely in industrial disputes when he is satisfied as to the merits of the controversy?

(*b*) Confine himself to the statement of general principles, and avoid pronouncing judgments?

(*c*) Avoid industrial subjects altogether, giving his attention only to questions relating to individual character and conduct?

Do you know of cases where ministers have lost their

pulpits through plain utterances on economic and industrial questions? Was it due to courage or to recklessness? What is the difference?

Are the churches usually generous employers? Are you thinking now of the minister's salary or the janitor's? What about the church publishing houses and administrative boards?

A Jewish community has been known to deny ritualistic burial to a man who during his life took usury. How far would a Christian church go in discipline for a social offense? How far has it a right to go?

Does a person who violates Christian principles in his business continue to feel at home among church people? If so, does it indicate Christian charity on the part of the congregation or something else?

What do you think of the suggestion that a church body might forego profits in its publishing enterprises, for example, in order to conduct experiments in industrial relations? Would it be more useful as an example if it should operate avowedly on a business basis in order to demonstrate that Christianity is not inconsistent with business success?

Does the average Sunday school fit young people for their part in the game of life? If not, what is the reason?

CHAPTER XIII

BUILDING THE FELLOWSHIP IN INDUSTRY—THE GREAT ADVENTURE

2 Timothy 2. 3; Hebrews 11. 1; Revelation 21. 1-3

Is the kind of religion we have been presenting in this course one to command the respect of virile men? Must we be pacifists to be Christians? Are we willing to be called pacifists if bearing our Christian testimony incurs that epithet? Will young men enlist for the new game as readily as for the old competitive struggle? Have we as Christians sufficient faith for the great adventure to make Christianity regnant in the world?

A "Masculine" Religion

Perhaps the mere use of such a title calls for an apology to women. But it embodies an issue which the ideas presented in this course are sure to encounter sooner or later. There is a popular tendency to give great honor to what are called "he-man" traits of character. The manner of life that seems to be most admired by women as well as men has a large measure of combat in it. What little honor is given to pacifism is apologetically rendered. It is considered at best a negative virtue. We should probably all have to agree that when Roosevelt spoke about "spineless pacifists" he was far from the New-Testament ideal, and inaccurate in his description, but there was something elemental in the characterization that no one can escape.

It is related that an imaginative moralist visited a public school in Philadelphia and told the pupils about a boy who was threatened by a bully and escaped a trouncing by bestowing upon his assailant a big red apple. The story left the children "cold." Then another visitor arose and innocently remarked that it was the boy who was able and willing to fight who got the apple. This commentary

brought a storm of applause. Perhaps this is typical in more ways than one. The boy who preferred peace to a thrashing, even at the cost of rewarding conduct that should have been condemned, is taken as a type of those who repudiate force. Most people are not sufficiently interested in the pacifist position to state it fairly. It is still taken for granted that combat plays a primary part in life, whether one thinks of individuals or of nations. Too generally people who profess Christianity may be classified, with reference to their attitude toward its teachings, in two groups: those who limit the sphere of its application and spend most of their time out of that sphere, and those who make their own version of Christianity, putting into it the "pep" which they think it lacks as ordinarily conceived.

Industrial War and the Wars of Nations

It might seem at first glance that we are here mixing up our course of study with one on international relations. But the fact is that the ethical problems of industry are one with the problem of war. It is the rivalries of industry and trade that constitute the most frequent cause of international disputes and hostile outbreaks. If the struggle going on in industry were satisfactorily terminated, there is good reason to think that there would seldom be occasion for war between nations. Moreover, the substitution of agreement for strife and of cooperation for competition is the same kind of a human task whether it is industrial groups or political governments that we seek to reconcile. It requires the same surrender of the "right" to get mad and demonstrate; the "right" to take what one has the power to take. It means getting one's fun not out of trouncing someone but out of comradeship with him in doing something worth while both to him and to oneself.

The Thrill of Combat and Adventure

There is something thrilling in war; everybody knows that. Likewise there is something thrilling in individualistic industrial enterprise that develops independence,

fearlessness, and hardihood. Even the cruel principle of "survival of the fittest" has an austere sublimity about it which the apostles of individualism have always made much of. The war against war is a deliberate effort to substitute other virtues for those that are paid for in human blood, to find channels of heroism that will conserve manhood rather than destroy it. If this be pacifism, we must make the most of it. At any rate it is anything but spineless. It is a man-sized job—if the twentieth century has one to offer. The redemption of industry is a part of that great task. It means finding some other foundation for the structure of enterprise, invention, and creation that the modern world is building than the old foundation that was laid in poverty and bitterness and the wrecks of those who were not stalwart enough to endure the strain. It means a federation of workers of hand and brain, a traffic in the satisfactions of fellowship, that will make man's spirit supreme over the things of the flesh.

Bondage to Pagan Ideals

It would be far from correct to say that our industrial history has been barren of social achievement. The old individualistic game has created a mechanism of production that was undreamed of a few centuries ago. The Industrial Revolution was manifestly one of the outstanding material achievements of history. But this great mechanical achievement, furnishing as it does the indispensable basis for a universal culture, has been totally inadequate on the side of motive. It whipped men up to the limit of what "enlightened self-interest" can accomplish. It has not even surveyed the possibilities of cooperative good will. Reliance upon self-interest as a motive makes inevitable the appeal to force as a method. Throughout industry to-day we find the easy assumption that force is the answer to any perplexing question that arises in the field of industrial relations. War in industry is an institution well established, financially well supported, for which leaders are especially trained and a professional technique has been developed. The making

of strikes is an art; equally so the breaking of strikes. If they should go out of vogue, a good many people would be out of a job. And they would not by any means be all labor leaders. Many men connected with management have as their chief qualification an ability to function quickly and economically when "strong-arm" methods are desired. But these rather unlovely accomplishments have been carefully cultivated in industry on both sides and they cannot be scrapped overnight.

Two Sets of Revolutionaries

Many people have become so weary of the contest going on in industry that they have felt like saying to the contending parties, "A plague on both your houses!" This feeling is responsible for the effort to take the whole matter out of the hands of employers and workers and put it in the control of the State. But that would be merely substituting a new regime of force for the old one, and it has thus far not succeeded.

There are two groups of people who are to-day advancing revolutionary doctrine with reference to the industrial situation. On the one hand are those who advocate abolishing summarily the present system of private property and enterprise. On the other hand are those who advocate doing away with the machinery by which a beginning has been made of joint government in industry through organizations of employers and workers. The first group of propagandists is little listened to in this country, but the second group has produced a great deal of industrial unrest. Perhaps it is only fair to say that they have been actuated in their aggressiveness by fear of what the propagandists of socialism might do. The net result, however, seems to be that the attention of the labor movement is focused on the efforts of employing interests to destroy it, and this means a continuance of belligerent tactics on labor's part. It is, to be sure, arguable that the solution of our labor problems is to be brought about not through any existing form of organization or any present device of bargaining and agreement; certainly we have a long way to go before we shall have

an industrial government based on cooperation and good will. But those who are best informed and wisest look for the progressive redemption of the present industrial organization on both sides, not for the arbitrary overthrow of what has been gradually evolved in response to a necessity. Men cannot be made either happy or just until they are made free. Self-limitation in the interest of greater freedom—that is the spirit of the new game and the chart of the great adventure.

Any plan for the reorganization of industrial life should take account of what we now find in industry—two fairly well-organized groups each contending for a set of "rights" which the other is unwilling or reluctant to recognize. To be sure, organized labor includes only a fraction of the industrial workers of America, but the fact remains that so many key industries, such as transportation, coal mining, building, and printing, are strongly organized that the influence of the labor unions is quite out of proportion to their membership. This may be taken for granted, and would it not be wiser for employers and the public to accept it as a continuing condition in industry?

The Redirection of Force

Given a free hand for the exercise of their proper functions, the belligerency of both workers' and employers' organizations may disappear. A wild lad who attached himself to a city Sunday school had his teachers nearly distracted with his disturbing conduct and the general destructiveness which organized itself wherever he was. By a stroke of inspiration he was appointed custodian of the hymn books. When that occurred he asked leave to address the school and made the following effective speech: "The first bloke that busts the back of one of these books will get his block knocked off." It was not his destructiveness that was primary in the situation but his undirected activity. It was a simple matter to be useful when there was something worth doing at hand. The particular method of discipline that he adopted was hardly exemplary but that too improved in due course.

New Incentives

The building of fellowship in industry is going on to-day, slowly, to be sure, but it is going on. And those who are engaged in it are getting a greater thrill out of the process than ever they had out of the old game. The old game yielded compensations not to be despised, but they were material and soon consumed. There is a limit to what one can consume.

> "For you can only wear one tie,
> And one eyeglass in your eye,
> Have one coffin when you die,
> Don't you know?"

But the stakes of the new game are measured in personality and power and the joy of fellowship and the common quest of nature's secrets and the conquest of nature's forces. There are industrial workshops which are psychological laboratories in which men and women are finding out the possibilities of joint effort and the strength of newly released motives. We are on our way to a great demonstration. Could anything be more thrilling than to have a part in it?

Where War Has Given Way to Peace

The maintenance of peace and a high production rate in the garment industry in Chicago during the last dozen years is a monument to the constructive powers of even the most aggressive forces in industry when there is a will to create something new in the field of human relations. Here the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, one of the strongest and most aggressive, so far as its philosophy is concerned, of the labor unions in this country, have developed in cooperation with the employers a sort of constitution for industrial relations and industrial rights with the avowed end of strengthening the interests of all parties concerned. It would be hard, perhaps, to connect this movement in any definite way with the development of "Christian ideals in industry," because these people are nearly all Jews. But it is not the first illustration of the fact that the Hebrew race,

from which Christianity sprang, is likely to put the exponents of our religion under a heavy obligation for the refinement and application of Christian ideals.

The work agreement that obtains in the factories of Hart, Schaffner & Marx in Chicago undertakes to secure to the employer the maintenance of "a high order of discipline and efficiency"; and to the workers in the plant "that they pass from the status of wage servants, with no claim on the employer save his economic need, to that of self-respecting parties to an agreement which they have had an equal part with him in making." And as for the national union in whose name, representing the workers, the contract is negotiated, it undertakes "to maintain, strengthen, and solidify its organization so that it may be made strong enough . . . to command the respect of the employer without being forced to resort to militant or unfriendly measures." It seems impossible to contemplate such a working agreement, whose success is a matter of several years' demonstration, and still hold to the militaristic philosophy which so largely dominates the industrial world.

To be sure, this plan of joint government is only the beginning of what we might call the creation of an industrial fellowship. It is still in the stage of bargaining, but there is the recognition of a mutual obligation to keep the agreement working and to maintain the integrity of the industry. It goes beyond the mere keeping of the industrial peace: the agreement calls expressly for "mutual consideration and concession, a willingness on the part of each party to regard and serve the interests of the other, so far as it can be done without too great a sacrifice of principle or interest." Would not Jesus say to these Jews in the clothing industry, in so far as they seek to live up to such an ideal, "Ye are not far from the kingdom of God"?

The New Solidarity

It would be an imperfect account indeed if we should not notice such establishments as the Columbia Conserve Company, of Indianapolis, where a striking effort is be-

ing made to organize the entire personnel, brain and hand workers, into a self-governing industrial unit, and where the president is deliberately trying to make the organization so effective that it will not need him; the Dutchess Bleachery at Wappingers Falls, New York, where in a textile establishment which offers many obstacles to the creation of fellowship, a notable demonstration of joint management is going on and a true partnership of effort is in the making. If space permitted, a considerable list of fruitful experiments might be given.

The remarkable thing about all this is the fact that there is growing up in these establishments that very loyalty to the industry which employers have complained was lacking in the labor movement. The "solidarity" of labor which the employer fears readily gives way to a new solidarity in which loyalty to the industry is primary, and the service of the community is an ultimate ideal.

Industrial establishments can be found to-day that present all stages of transition, from the old game of competitive self-interest to the new game of mutual service. It is true that the most notable approaches to an industrial fellowship are found in small institutions. Large employers are wont to say that such idealistic undertakings could not be carried out in large concerns. But the experience of the small establishment is vital to the Christian quest in industry. Great movements have modest beginnings. The small establishment is the best experiment station. This is an important fact when it is remembered that the vast majority of industrial concerns are small enough to make such experimentation possible. There are difficulties all along the line, but what is Christian faith for?

The Great Adventure

What is driving these employers and workers—these "idealists" who are so ready to set at naught industrial traditions? It is all very simple when you have watched them for a while. They are playing a great game. Profits and wages are of secondary importance when men engage in the great adventure of making a Christian

world. They feel the thrill of the fisherman-disciple who has heard the call, "Follow me, and I will make you a fisher of men"! To "carry on" there must be young men and women who will go into business precisely as others go into the foreign-missionary service. There must be young men of ideals who will take up industrial engineering as a profession. There must be men and women who will enter the labor movement with the same spirit that would take them into the most exalted public service.

We quoted earlier a part of Burton Braley's poem "Business Is Business." In the concluding stanzas he has well characterized the great adventure:

"Business is Business," the Big Man said,
"But it's something that's more, far more;
For it makes sweet gardens of deserts dead,
And cities it built now roar
Where once the deer and gray wolf ran
From the pioneer's swift advance;
Business is Magic that toils for man.
Business is True Romance.

"And those who make it a ruthless fight
Have only themselves to blame
If they feel no whit of the keen delight
In playing the Bigger Game—
The game that calls on the heart and head,
The best of man's strength and nerve;
"Business is Business," the Big Man said,
"And that Business is to serve!"

The Conquest of Industry

A religion to which the twentieth century will give allegiance must have a program as large as life. The biggest thing in life is the work men do; they can never be saved apart from it, only in it. Work itself must be redeemed, and the Christian program for its redemption is the building of the industrial fellowship. It is in the world of work, still more than on the far-flung battle line of our foreign missionary crusade, that Christianity must be vindicated and its supremacy established. It is in industry, where men have fought so bitterly, that the most

obstinate resistance to the Christian faith is being put forth. Industry is the great modern mission field. Men are to-day walking and working in darkness under the domination of pagan ideals of self-interest and conflict. It is the faith of a modern Christian that Christianity can penetrate and dispel that darkness and, in Milton's splendid metaphor, create a soul under the ribs of death!

For the Discussion Group

Why do we hear so much about a man's religion? Are the so-called "masculine" traits in our religion the best traits?

Does human nature require the satisfactions of conquest? Must it be gained through personal encounter? Does "peace on earth to men of good will" have any definite relation to the world of business and industry?

Is our continued dependence on force—physical, military, and economic—due to a natural love of combat, or does fear play a part in it?

Why is the military hero accorded first place in human esteem? Is this as true to-day as formerly? Who has gained the largest measure of satisfaction out of life—Marshal Foch or Thomas Edison?

Is there more romance in the struggles and hazards of business enterprise than in acts of moral heroism and social endeavor? Who had more fun out of living—Jacob Riis or the elder J. P. Morgan?

What was the incentive of the "dollar-a-year men" who gave their services to the government during the war? Is it possible to develop a similar incentive in time of peace?

Are the demonstrations of cooperation in industry that are cited in the text significant or are they the result of an unusual idealism of which most people are incapable? What would the average employer say about them?

To-day we send ministers, teachers, and doctors into our mission fields. Why not industrial experts and engineers?

Is it fact or fancy that "business is true romance"? Is it more or less true than it used to be? What have we as individuals had to do with it?